

THEOLOGICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF PENN.

AUG 2 1931

# Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT and BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XIII

JULY, 1931

NUMBER 3

## CONTENTS

Translations of Bishops.....	<i>Jos. Cullen Ayer</i>	271
Astral Mythology in the Revelation..	<i>Philip Carrington</i>	289
The Angel of Peace, Uriel, Metatron....	<i>Chaim Kaplan</i>	306
Adult Religious Education.....	<i>Frederick C. Grant</i>	314
Regarding a Review.....	<i>Burton Scott Easton</i>	323
Notes and Comments.....	<i>Burton Scott Easton</i>	329
Book Reviews.....		334
Notes on New Books.....		358

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET  
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

PRINCE AND LEMON STS.  
LANCASTER, PA.

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.00 A YEAR

# Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XIII

JULY, 1931

NUMBER 3

EDITOR IN CHIEF: THE VERY REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., Dean of  
Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois  
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of  
New Testament Interpretation and Literature, General Theological Seminary,  
New York City

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. PROFESSOR ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D., Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut  
REV. PROFESSOR LORING W. BATTEN, D.D., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary  
MR. RALPH ADAMS CRAM, D.C.L., Boston, Massachusetts  
HON. CHARLES LEMUEL DIBBLE, D.C.L., Kalamazoo, Michigan  
REV. CANON CHARLES WINFRED DOUGLAS, Mus.D., Evergreen, Colorado  
REV. PROFESSOR WILLIAM HASKELL DUBOSE, D.D., University of the South  
REV. PROFESSOR ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, M.A., Western Theological Seminary  
VERY REV. HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D., Dean of the General Theological  
Seminary  
REV. PROFESSOR FRANK GAVIN, Th.D., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary  
REV. PROFESSOR HERBERT H. GOWEN, D.D., University of Washington  
VERY REV. BERRYMAN GREEN, D.D., LL.D., Dean of the Virginia Theological Seminary  
REV. PROFESSOR HENRY RILEY GUMMEY, JR., M.A., S.T.D., D.C.L., Philadelphia  
Divinity School  
REV. PROFESSOR FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Baldwinsville, New York  
REV. FRANK HUDSON HALLOCK, D.D., Western Theological Seminary  
REV. PROFESSOR F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Union Theological Seminary  
VERY REV. WILLIAM PALMER LADD, D.D., Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School  
RT. REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D., Bishop of New York  
REV. JOHN A. MAYNARD, D.D., Ph.D., Pd.D., Eglise du S. Esprit, New York City  
REV. PROFESSOR DANIEL ARTHUR MCGREGOR, M.A., S.T.M., Ph.D., Western Theological  
Seminary  
REV. PROFESSOR SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D., Trinity College, University  
of Toronto  
REV. PROFESSOR NORMAN B. NASH, Episcopal Theological School  
REV. PROFESSOR PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary  
RT. REV. PHILIP M. RHINELANDER, D.D., College of Preachers, Washington, D. C.  
PROFESSOR VIDA D. SCUDDER, M.A., L.H.D., Wellesley College  
RT. REV. GEORGE CRAIG STEWART, D.D., L.H.D., S.T.D., Bishop of Chicago  
REV. PROFESSOR MARSHALL BOWYER STEWART, D.D., General Theological Seminary  
REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D., St. Alban's School, Sycamore, Illinois  
RT. REV. WILLIAM WALTER WEBB, D.D., Bishop of Milwaukee  
REV. PROFESSOR WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, B.D., Nashotah House

## COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut	NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, Philadelphia	TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts	TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City	PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia
	WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

The REVIEW is published four times a year in January, April, July and October. Subscription price, \$3.00 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to the Editor in Chief, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, June 17, 1919, at the post-office at Lancaster, Pa., under the act of March 3, 1870.

Application for transfer of second-class mailing privilege to Evanston, Ill., pending.







# Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

---

VOLUME XIII

JULY, 1931

NUMBER 3

---

## TRANSLATIONS OF BISHOPS

By JOS. CULLEN AYER, The Divinity School, Philadelphia

By translation of a bishop is to be understood the removal of a bishop from one diocese, over which he had full and undelegated jurisdiction, *i.e.*, of which he was ordinary, to another diocese, of which he assumes the same jurisdiction, thus ceasing to be the ordinary of the first diocese and becoming the ordinary of the second. In the case of the removal of a bishop suffragan, inasmuch as such bishop is not the ordinary, is not bishop of the diocese and performs only such episcopal functions as may be assigned to him from time to time, there is not a translation. Historically he represents the bishop *in partibus infidelium*, who, regarded by a fiction of law as having been prevented from going to his see, because it was in hostile infidel country, assists the bishop of another diocese. Of necessity this fiction of the Canon Law has been dropped in England since the Reformation and has never existed in the Episcopal Church in the United States. The question of the canonical possibility of the removal of a bishop suffragan to another diocese has been answered affirmatively by the American canons permitting it. And though the Canon Law should have settled the question, yet because of long American custom, it was well to state this to remove any doubt by a special mention of the possibility of such translation. The question as to translation of a bishop is clearly therefore one that concerns the case of the ordinary of the diocese, not the suffragan. The case of the bishop coadjutor, *cum jure successionis*, has com-

plications into which space does not permit one to enter. Suffice it to say that such an episcopal appointment was distinctly contrary to the practice and canons of the early Church, though it did occasionally occur; *e.g.*, St. Augustine was consecrated as what we would call bishop coadjutor. It is, however, important to call attention to the case of such coadjutor because any appeal to the binding authority of ancient canons in the matter of translations, just because they are the ancient canons, or of certain councils because of their doctrinal importance, is vitiated by the fact that we do have such coadjutors. It may be justly questioned, therefore, whether such canons have any force among us except as expressing the ancient sentiment to be followed or not as more recent circumstances demand and later canons provide. There will be occasion to develop this point in the course of the examination of episcopal translations.

There are two points involved in a translation, viz., first, the bishop ceases to be the ordinary of a diocese by his own act, resigning it rather than being removed from it by deposition; second, the bishop becomes the ordinary of another diocese. There is here no question of validity of episcopal orders. Once conferred they are retained even after deposition and excommunication. When a deposed or an excommunicated bishop is restored or is reconciled, he who once was put out of his see is not reconsecrated, but is given the right to officiate, to exercise the powers of his orders, which powers he can never lose. A bishop who has resigned remains a bishop, but he may exercise his orders when and where authorized by any bishop having jurisdiction, but only within the territorial limits of that bishop's jurisdiction. He differs from a suspended bishop in that he does not need any judicial act to give him authority to exercise his orders, and his inability to act apart from authorization implies no censure or disgrace. It is entirely a question of having, or not having, jurisdiction. It is a matter of positive Canon Law, not of theology or "Divine Law," just when and where he can function as having episcopal orders.

That a bishop should not resign his office, still less leave one

diocese, to which he had been appointed and had assumed jurisdiction, to assume jurisdiction of another diocese, was for centuries the general sentiment of the Ancient Church. To the men of the first few centuries it seemed to imply unwillingness to do the work for which it was believed that with divine approval he had been solemnly set aside. Often it seemed to involve unworthy ambition, a seeking of a more important, better maintained and more influential see. But to say that resignations and translations were unlawful in the Ancient Church is quite unwarranted. Canons of the most important councils, however sweeping in their language, were not regarded as of such authority as to be observed everywhere. In all parts of the Church there were resignations and translations, and eventually they were brought under general rules, although they were always regarded as exceptional and liable to abuse, and to be allowed only under special conditions approved by competent authority. The canons to the contrary never found general acceptance, however imposing the doctrinal authority of councils promulgating them, and they were superseded by later canons and established practice.

The first instance of a translation, or the removal, of a bishop from one see to another appears to have been that of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, the coadjutor and successor of Narcissus. This was early in the third century. Alexander, bishop of an unknown place in Cappadocia, when visiting Jerusalem was induced to remain in that city to assist the aged bishop.<sup>1</sup> The circumstances were exceptional and were regarded as irregular or exceptional. When action on the whole question was eventually taken, it was not in view of this case or possibly others known to us, but as a part of a larger principle. The clergy of any rank whatsoever in the hierarchy should not remove from one church to another. A man was ordained for a special position, though he might be advanced to a higher position in the same church. Ordinations were not absolute, *i.e.*, were not bestowed without title. Chalcedon (can. 6) even declared them invalid.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. ec.*, VI, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hefele, *History of Councils*, sec. 200 (II, 511).

The earliest conciliar pronouncement on the removal of clergy from one place to another was made at Arles, 314 A.D. By its second canon it was ordered that every ordained man should remain where he was ordained.<sup>3</sup> By the twenty-first canon of the same council presbyters and deacons removing from one place to another should be deposed. Apparently the removal of bishops was as yet unheard of in the West, and no action seemed called for. At Nicea, 325 A.D., however, the prohibition of clerical removals was extended to cover the case of bishops as well as presbyters and deacons, and that too without any provision for exceptional cases.<sup>4</sup> As this canon is regarded in many quarters as settling the matter, it should be examined in detail.

The Nicene Canon reads as follows:

"The numerous troubles and divisions which take place have caused it to be found good to abolish the custom, which prevails in certain places, contrary to the Apostolic Canon; so that neither Bishop, Presbyter, nor Deacon shall pass from city to city. If anyone, after the decree of the Great and Holy Synod, shall attempt any such thing or continue in such a course, his action (*i.e.*, his removal) shall be utterly void, and he shall be restored to the Church in which he was ordained Bishop or Presbyter."

1. It appears that the passage of clergy ordained in one city to another had been frequent enough to be regarded as a custom. To what extent this was true of bishops is unknown. Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was present at Nicea and was leader of the Arians, had been bishop of Berytus before he was bishop of Nicomedia. Subsequently he became bishop of Constantinople. Possibly there were others.

2. To what ancient canon the Nicene Canon refers it is impossible to determine. It is hardly likely to have been to the fifteenth of the so-called Apostolic Canons, for that is evidently later and provides for such translation, and the twelfth of the same collection also apparently provides for such translation. Probably Apostolic Canon means mere Apostolic rule or custom, and was regarded as Apostolic because it was ancient.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hefele, *op. cit.*, sec. 15 (I, 205).

<sup>4</sup> Can. 15, Hefele, *op. cit.*, sec. 42 (I, 418 f.).

3. Whatever unconditional prohibition of translation of bishops may be based on the Nicene Canon and held as universally binding because Nicene, the same prohibition applies to the removal of presbyters and deacons, and just as unconditionally and universally. The appeal to this canon proves too much.

4. The Council of Antioch "In encaeniis," 341 A.D., in passing much important legislation which received wide acceptance, repeated the Nicene prohibition of removal or translation of all clergy, bishops, presbyters, or deacons, from one city to another and that too without provision for exceptional cases. Chalcedon, 451 A.D., repeated the same prohibition of the removal of clergy.<sup>5</sup>

Nicea and Antioch, however, were by no means expressive of the whole mind of the Church in the matter. A less inflexible rule was taking shape, one that admitted of exceptions. A man ordained in one church might be moved to another church, and the possible abuses connected with the practice were provided for. This may be found in canons thirteen and fourteen (14 and 15) of the Apostolic Canons.<sup>6</sup> "It is not lawful for a bishop to leave his own parish (*i.e.*, diocese, in the modern sense of the term) and pass over into another, although he be pressed by many to do so, unless there be some reasonable cause constraining him, such as when he can confer some greater benefit upon the persons of the place in the word of piety, and this must be done, not of his own motion, but by the judgment of many bishops and at their earnest exhortation." No one would claim this canon to be Apostolic, or even prior to Nicea. It clearly represents a needed modification in the strictness of Nicea and Antioch. Circumstances might arise when it might be expedient for a man with unusual gifts to act as bishop in some other city than that in which he had been ordained or consecrated. But the translation should only be exceptional, should be for sound reasons, and should strictly be controlled by some conciliar action or higher

<sup>5</sup> Cc. 3, 21. Cf. Hefele, *op. cit.*, sec. 56 (I, 514, 519; cc. 5, 6, 10. Hefele, sec. 200).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Bruns, *Canones Apostolorum*, I, 2.

authority. A whole series of councils, East and West, can be cited in support of this position.<sup>7</sup> What had been feared was that ambitious bishops might for quite worldly reasons seek larger and wealthier sees than their original sees. Without doubt, in the greatly changed condition of the Church which came in during the fourth and fifth centuries, there was abundant ground for such fear. An abuse of what should always be an exception was prevented by the action of a council before a translation might be permitted.

The orderly development of a system whereby translations might still be further systematized was complicated by an idea which appears to have first been expressed by Athanasius, that the relation of a bishop to his diocese was a sort of mystical marriage, and translation was therefore akin to adultery.<sup>8</sup> It was a fantastic idea, belonging to the acrimonious disputes of the time; and it certainly appealed to the imagination of many.<sup>9</sup> Under various forms it appears for centuries, even long after translations had become common occurrences.<sup>10</sup>

## II

In the West considerable objection was long to be found to translations of bishops. Possibly it was because the practice in the East showed a failure to prevent the abuses to which translations were easily open. Ambitious ecclesiastics were given to seeking "larger spheres of influence" and having themselves translated to more attractive bishoprics. And this was done at times with imperial and not with conciliar approval. There were, however, causes which made for occasional translation even in that part of the Church which on the whole reprobated them. In the troublous times of the "Barbarian Invasions" bishops were often driven out of their sees. Even after a more or less

<sup>7</sup> Cf. c. 37, Carthage, 397 A.D.; c. 27, Carthage, 398 A.D.; etc.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arianos*, sec. 6. He is attacking Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had been twice translated.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Jerome, *Ep. LXIX ad Oceanum*, MSL. 22: 658.

<sup>10</sup> Cf., e.g., cc. 2, 3, X. *de translatione episcopi*. I. 7, circa 1196 A.D.



settled government was established, sudden political changes affected the position of the hierarchy. Instances of such translations are to be found everywhere. In England, where precedents are of special value to Anglicans, we find some early cases of translation. In the tenth century Oswald of Worcester was translated to York. St. Dunstan, than whom there was no greater champion of order and discipline in the Church, was successively Bishop of Worcester, Bishop of London, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury. Such changes were on the authority of the Anglo-Saxon king, and the pope had nothing to do with them. Other bishops were translated to Canterbury, both before and after Dunstan. The removal from any non-archiepiscopal see to an archiepiscopal or metropolitan see was as much a translation from see to see as any other, and was regarded as forbidden by canons prohibiting translations.

In the case of the see of Rome the firm hold of the older customs is surprising. If any see might be the object of ambition, it was Rome. Yet apparently the first to be translated thither was Marinus (882-884), bishop of Caere (Cervetri, 27 miles N. of Rome) before becoming Bishop of Rome. The unfortunate Formosus (891-896) was previously bishop of Porto and is often regarded as the first bishop translated to Rome. The charge brought against him by his infamous successor, Stephen VII, was that he had previously been the bishop of another see, and therefore not validly bishop of Rome. Auxilius, a priest ordained by Formosus, wrote in the defence of his translation, and John IX, in a Roman council, 898 A.D.,<sup>11</sup> expressly exonerated Formosus and approved his translation according to the canons which permitted translation when it was for the benefit of the Church, and not a matter of ambition.<sup>12</sup> It was regarded, however, as exceptional and not as a precedent.

After the year one thousand translations became more and more a practice, but it was generally felt that only with the consent of the pope were they valid, that they should not be on account

<sup>11</sup> Mansi places erroneously in 904.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Hefele, *op. cit.*, sec. 510.



of ambition, but for the good of the Church, *i.e.*, not of one's own motion, and that they should be voluntary. Thomassin<sup>13</sup> gives a long list of such translations in all countries. Thus there grew up a well-established custom of translation on authorization of superior authority, and when Gratian wrote his *Decretum*, he found a place for it as an acknowledged legal principle.<sup>14</sup> It is interesting to note that the principal authorities cited by him are from the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals. Whether these decretals in this respect, as in so many others, had an eye for the fortunes of Ebo of Rheims, who had been displaced by Hincmar, is a natural question to be asked. Ebo had been made bishop of Hildersheim about the time of the forgery of these decretals. Gratian, however, quotes also the canon of the Council of Carthage<sup>15</sup> which had always governed the matter, that not from ambition but only by synodal authority might a bishop be translated, but inferior clergy only with the consent of their bishops.

In the ninth century we find mention of papal approbation of a translation in addition to the action of a synod. Hincmar could write in connection with the old rule against resignation of bishops, *i.e.*, change without authority: "If, however, a case of real necessity or need demands that a bishop should be transferred from the city in which he had been ordained to another city, the translation ought to be by the action of a synod and (*vel = et*) consent of the Apostolic See."<sup>16</sup> As the ancient synod declined in authority very rapidly after the time of Hincmar, the only consenting ecclesiastical authority was eventually the pope. It was one of the special powers of the papacy, as stated in the well-known *Dictata* attributed to Gregory VII, "That to him it is permitted on urgent necessity to transfer bishops from see to see." At times translations were made by royal authority, but such practice was regarded as a gross irregularity.<sup>17</sup>

The Medieval Canon Law as to resignation and as to transla-

<sup>13</sup> *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline*, iv, 553 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. C. 7, Qu. I, pars 5.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Bruns, I, 144; c. 37, C. 7, Qu. I.

<sup>16</sup> Ep. 31. *De translatione episcoporum*, MSL. 126: 213.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. c. 4, X. de elect I. 6 (Paschal, II, 11 and 18).

tions of bishops was put into permanent shape largely by Innocent III and appears in two titles of the first book of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*. The principal points as to translations were as follows.<sup>18</sup>

C. 2. Only the Pope might translate a bishop from one see to another; it was a case reserved for him. There had been a spiritual marriage between the bishop and his diocese and only the Pope could dissolve it.

C. 3. If a bishop on his own authority removed from one diocese to another, he lost both dioceses.

C. 4. Inasmuch as a translation is a special privilege, an exception to the general rule of Canon Law, the conditions must be strictly observed. This last is really redundant, as it was merely the application of a general rule of Canon Law as to exceptions made to the application of laws.

Here we have the practice of the Ancient Church adapted to the conditions of the Medieval Church. There is no mention now made of a synod as necessary or as sufficient to authorize a translation. That had fallen out completely. It had become a general principle that all matters relating to bishops were *causae majores* and belonged to the pope, and the matter of translation of bishops naturally fell to him. As he had all authority and consequently was superior to synods, he could translate. All canon law was regarded as emanating from him, and he could suspend, or grant exceptions to, canons.

In the Medieval Church translations of bishops became little less than a gross abuse in the hands of the papacy; especially was this the case after the custom of paying annates had become established. These annates were a year's income paid to the pope on an ecclesiastical promotion. Consequently, if an important see fell vacant it might be filled by appointing to it not a priest, but a bishop of another see. As this translation would leave the bishop's see vacant, it could be filled by another translation, and the process might be continued almost indefinitely. If the translation was in each case from a smaller to a more

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Tit. X, *de translatione episcopi*, I. 7.

important see there might be less opposition to it, and it was sometimes possible to carry on a series of a dozen translations by utilizing a vacancy in an important see. One might imagine Canterbury filled from London, London from Winchester, Winchester from Lincoln, Lincoln from Worcester, Worcester from Salisbury, Salisbury from Bath and Wells, Bath and Wells from Bangor. At each translation annates would be paid. And the system was possible by the disregard of capitular rights of election, and translating against the will of the bishop concerned. The whole was a gross abuse against which the Council of Constance (Sess. 39) and Basel (Sess. 29, c. 3) protested with good intention and small effect. It will, perhaps, be recalled that these annates were found in 1534 so intolerable and so insupportable by the English Church that the clergy were relieved of paying them to the Pope, and they were annexed to the Crown. More than one hundred and fifty years later they became the principal source of Queen Anne's Bounty.

### III

This papal authority as to translations certainly formed a part of the Canon Law in force in England when in the time of Henry VIII the statute, "In Restraint of Appeals" (24 Henry VIII, c. 12), cut off the connection which had existed between the Church of England and the See of Rome, but the Canon Law except so far as contrary to statute and to the royal prerogative remained. The jurisdiction of the pope came to an end. No bulls for confirmation or consecration or other matters connected with the appointment of bishops were to be sought at Rome. English authority was to suffice.

In the new system as then set up, the mandates of the King took the place of the bulls formerly required. A bishop to be translated must be elected as any other bishop. The chapter of the cathedral church acted upon a *cong   d'  lire*, choosing, under heavy penalty, the clerk named by the King in a letter missive. The election was then certified to the King. The

bishop-elect did fealty, the election was then certified to the Archbishop under the Great Seal, and he was required to confirm the election. Nothing more was required.<sup>19</sup> The King, as Supreme Head, took the place of the Pope, and no synodal authorization was necessary, for it had quite fallen out of the Canon Law.

In England translations took place as a matter of course after the Reformation. As there were very great differences in the importance and in the emoluments of bishoprics, bishops were constantly being advanced from smaller and poorer to larger and richer sees. This was most clearly seen in the case of the archbishopric of Canterbury, the greatest see in the Church. An archbishopric is merely a see to which a dignity and jurisdiction is attached in relation to the other bishops of the Province; the archbishop is the metropolitan. But a transfer from an episcopal see in the province to the archiepiscopal see is as much a translation as from one see to any other, for the Archbishop is first of all the bishop of his own diocese, and in virtue of that fact has archiepiscopal dignity. Although Cranmer and Parker were appointed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury without previously holding any other see, the successors of Parker without exception reached the primacy of all England only after holding at least one other see. Grindal was successively bishop of London (1559), archbishop of York (1577) and of Canterbury (1583); Whitgift of Worcester (1577) and of Canterbury (1583); Bancroft of London (1597) and Canterbury (1604); Abbott of Coventry and Lichfield (1609), holding the see about a month and then passing to Canterbury (1610); Laud was successively bishop of St. David's (1621), Bath and Wells (1626), London (1628) and Canterbury (1633). Sheldon, before becoming archbishop (1663), had been bishop of London (1660). To take some later instances of translations quite at random: Gibson was bishop of Lincoln (1716), then bishop of London (1720), and later declined the primacy. Joseph Butler was bishop of Bristol and later of Durham; Samuel Wilberforce was bishop of Oxford (1845) before he became bishop of Winchester

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Gibson, *Codex juris ecclesiastici*, p. 111.

(1869); Temple was bishop of Exeter (1869), of London (1885) and later of Canterbury (1897).

These instances of translation might be multiplied almost indefinitely. They are sufficient, however, to show that the translation of bishops was a recognized part of the English ecclesiastical system, before and after the American Revolution and the resulting severance of the Church in the United States of America and the Church of England. The general body of Canon Law of the Anglican Communion, or general body of legal principles, was recognized as the heritage of the Church, and the American Church retained the general body of Canon Law under which it had existed prior to the Revolution. And this applies to every Church which, originally a part of the Church of England, has in self-governing colonies become independent churches. The daughter church may modify the common ecclesiastical law by local enactments, but unless so modified or rendered inoperative it is, unless fallen into desuetude, law still. The question therefore is not what were the canons of the Church in the fourth or fifth century, but what was the law and practice of the Church of England. And here there is not a shadow of a doubt.

#### IV

In the American branch of the Anglican Communion it would appear that the translation of bishops should have been recognized as a matter of the common law of the Church. It would be according to the general principle that that common law continued in force unless the conditions of the Church rendered it inapplicable. It is very difficult to see how translations were incompatible with American conditions. And the same may be said in respect to resignations of the episcopate, acts which were involved in every translation. But as a matter of fact there was distinct opposition both to resignation and to translation. Probably the memory of the Nicene Canon, of which the ancient force was misunderstood, had place here. Fanciful antiquarianism has not been wholly absent from our Church's history.

Early in the history of the independent American Church a case of resignation occurred, that of Bishop Provoost of New York in 1801. The resignation was made to the Diocesan Convention and accepted by it, for as yet there was no canon of the General Convention on the resignations of bishops. The other bishops of the Church, White, Clagget and Jarvis, disapproved of Bishop Provoost's action. To them it seemed the betrayal of a most sacred trust. It should be recalled that the grounds for the resignation were quite personal and have been generally regarded as inadequate. The bishops proposed that there should be an assistant or coadjutor bishop during Bishop Provoost's lifetime and they were willing to consecrate such. There had been little precedent for a resignation of a bishopric, apart, of course, from translation where the thought of resignation of the first see was forgotten in the acceptance of the second. (Archbishop St. Edmund Rich of Canterbury appears to have resigned (1240); recently Archbishop Davidson resigned. There have been resignations of other bishops.) The outcome of the matter was that Bishop Moore was consecrated Bishop of New York, but there is not a word in his certificate of consecration to the effect that he was coadjutor. Ten years later in order to defeat the election of John Henry Hobart as assistant to the infirm Bishop Moore, Bishop Provoost attempted to resume his episcopal authority. But he was clearly informed by the Diocesan Convention that he had resigned and could not resume the jurisdiction.

Two other cases may be cited as having some bearing upon resignations and translations, viz., the case of Bishop Philander Chase and the case of Bishop H. C. Lay. Bishop Chase resigned the diocese of Ohio in 1831. The resignation was accepted by the Convention of the diocese. There was still no general canon of the Church governing procedure in the case of the resignation of a bishop. Chase then removed to Michigan, which according to the idea of the Church then prevailing was regarded as "beyond the jurisdiction of this Church," for no diocese or Church had been organized as yet in that State. His resignation was the occasion of some extensive legislation of the



General Convention of 1832, evidently designed to make episcopal resignations very difficult<sup>20</sup> and to limit very seriously episcopal actions of a resigned bishop. Apparently there was the desire to secure the position of Bishop McIlvaine, who had just been elected to Ohio. A few clergy and laity in the State of Illinois meeting at Peoria, March 9, 1835, "Resolved, unanimously, that this Convention do hereby appoint the Rt. Rev. Philander Chase, D.D., a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, to the Episcopate of Illinois; and that he be and hereby is invited to remove into this Diocese, and to assume Episcopal jurisdiction in the same."<sup>21</sup> Bishop Chase, as he himself says (*ibid.*), knew nothing about the matter until receiving this invitation. He accepted it and assumed jurisdiction. It was a sort of translation.

The new diocese was received into union with the General Convention in the year of its organization. But the Committee to whom the matter was referred, Bishops Brownell, Onderdonk and Meade, in their report deemed the circumstances "not entirely in consonance with the regulations of the Church," but admitted "the case was unprovided for by the canons of the Church." As there was no probability that a similar case could occur thereafter, and for "other special considerations," they recommended the admission of the diocese of Illinois.<sup>22</sup> In Bishop Chase's case are the points comprised in a "translation." A bishop of a diocese resigns one diocese, ceases to be its bishop, and becomes the bishop of another diocese. As there was an interval of four years between the resignation and acceptance it was clear that ambition, as feared in ancient legislation, was not involved. But on the other hand he had not acted with the authority of any council or superior authority. His case was certainly "not in consonance with the regulations of the Church." It was more of the nature of "migration."

The next action of the Church in the matter of translations was

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Hawks, *Constitutions and Canons*, pp. 302-305.

<sup>21</sup> *Bishop Chase's Reminiscences*, Boston, 1848, II, 47.

<sup>22</sup> See *Journal of the General Convention of 1835. House of Bishops*, p. 91.



a drastic canon passed in the General Convention of 1844 on the resignation of bishops, the fourth section of which reads: "No bishop whose resignation of the Episcopal jurisdiction of a Diocese has been consummated pursuant to this Canon, shall under any circumstances be eligible to any Diocese now in union or which may hereafter be admitted into union with this Church." While the canon rendered it less difficult for a bishop to resign and left the acceptance of the resignation entirely to the House of Bishops, it evidently aimed to prevent a recurrence of any case such as that of Bishop Philander Chase. Translations were thus distinctly forbidden. In making resignations subject to action of the House of Bishops the canon was so far in line with the ancient canons. A man might not resign on his own motion, abandon his jurisdiction, as did Bishop Provoost. There must be synodal action, and not merely diocesan. This canon remained unchanged until 1904, when in the general revision of the whole body of canons the provision as to eligibility of a bishop who had resigned to become bishop of another diocese, *i.e.*, forbidding translations, was dropped.

The case of Bishop Lay was quite different. He was a missionary bishop put in charge of Arkansas in 1859. During the Civil War, the Church in Arkansas was constituted a diocese by the action of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America. This was in accordance with the constitution of that Church, which in several respects reflected the political opinions prevalent in the South. Lay automatically became bishop of the Diocese of Arkansas, ceasing to be a Missionary Bishop deriving authority from a General Convention. When the Civil War came to an end, the authority of the Church in the Confederate States ended in the South. What then was the status of Bishop Lay? During the War the General Convention had never recognized the secession of the Southern Dioceses. In the roll-calls their names were to be found. Any action of a Southern General Convention was naturally treated as quite invalid. Arkansas had never been constituted a diocese by the only body having the right so to act. It remained what it had always

been: a missionary jurisdiction. Bishop Lay very loyally acquiesced in the change of his status. He was still a Missionary Bishop. Shortly after this the diocese of Easton was organized to include the "Eastern Shore" of Maryland and he was elected Bishop. As a Missionary Bishop he was entirely eligible. The case of Bishop Lay is not that of translation, as Arkansas was not a diocese. The Southern Church had no canonical existence. The authority of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America extended throughout the Union in the same way that the authority of the Congress at Washington was at all times legally coextensive with the territory of the United States.

Missionary bishops as they exist in the American Church are quite anomalous, at least according to the ancient canons. They are a part of a system whereby a body of bishops has a jurisdiction larger than the sum of their respective dioceses. Undoubtedly there have been ample justifications for such a novelty. They are subject to a synod which may move them about from place to place. The actual jurisdiction would appear to be in the synod and not in the bishop. No such system is thinkable according to the canon law of the Eastern or Western Church. Yet we have it, and it evidently works well. It would be well to recall such an institution when any appeal is made to the ancient canons.

## V

What is the present situation as to translations of bishops?  
(1) Translations of bishops have become a part of the canonical system of all parts of the historic Church. In the Anglican Communion, except for sixty years in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, it has been an established custom for a thousand years, and it was a part of that general Canon Law which the American Church inherited. Since 1904 there has been no canon in that Church which forbids translation. The deliberate omission of the very special and quite unusual prohibition of translations can only have one mean-

ing, that the conditions having passed whereby translations were forbidden by exceptional legislation, they are not now forbidden but are under the general canon law.

(2) The provision for the election of a missionary bishop or a suffragan bishop to a diocesan episcopate far from limiting the election of one already bishop to such, and thereby forbidding translation of diocesan bishops, merely provides for an exceptional type of bishop; for a Missionary Bishop, such as exists in the American Church, is so much a novelty that it was well to provide for the new form of episcopate. A bishop suffragan in the older Canon Law was a bishop *in partibus infidelium*. As the office exists in the American Church it is almost as anomalous, though possibly adapted to American conditions. For such a novel form of episcopate provision had to be made. In both cases the bishop was brought under the general law of translations as far as it was possible.

(3) The machinery for carrying out of a translation and the control of the practice already exists in the American Canons. The essential point in the ancient system allowing translations was the control of the whole matter. A bishop might not abandon his diocese, to which he had been elected and consecrated, without the action of a synod. No bishop may resign his jurisdiction without the consent of the House of Bishops. As translation involved the resignation, it could not take place without the consent of that body to the resignation or abandonment of a diocese by a bishop elected to another diocese. As one of the motives, the principal motive, for the resignation was the acceptance of the second diocese, it would be within the power of the House of Bishops to permit or prevent the translation by refusing to allow the resignation. What the Church feared, and no doubt with good reason, had been the seeking of larger dioceses by ambitious and selfish bishops located in small dioceses. When the good of the Church called for a translation, it would be unwise to prevent it. When it was due to ambition, it would be the duty of the House of Bishops to veto it, by refusing to accept the necessary resignation.

(4) Should it be agreed that translations of bishops are for-

bidden by ancient canons, *e.g.*, Nicea, A.D. 325, and Antioch, A.D. 341, the answer would be (a) that such canons were exceptional and were abrogated by canons to the contrary of other councils, clearly showing that they were not regarded as of such superior authority that they always bound the Church without possible abrogation. (b) That such ancient canons applied to all orders of the clergy, presbyters as well as bishops, and they have been abrogated by the American Church in which the practice of letters dimissory, of more than a thousand years, has been followed. In other words, they are not regarded as necessarily binding, but may be and actually have been abrogated by our legislation. The letters dimissory in the case of priests and deacons correspond to synodal action in the case of bishops. Clergy of all orders could not migrate at will from place to place; they might with consent of the higher authority move or be translated.

Whether the regular practice of translations will ever be established in the American Church as it is in England may be doubted. But there seems to be a call for some clear declaration of principle, as it sometimes happens that a bishop might resign a bishopric for reasons amply justified by existing conditions, and later the conditions might change. For him to accept another diocese would be tantamount to a translation. Should he accept an election to such diocese it would certainly not be a case of deserting a diocese for ambition or a mere migration, the real point of the canons which forbade such improper action and of the canons which allowed translation. In the case of the resignation of a bishop coadjutor, who in the American Church always has the right of succession, we are dealing with a type of episcopate which was no part of the early Canon Law, but belongs to that more developed Canon Law which regularized translations.

## ASTRAL MYTHOLOGY IN THE REVELATION

By PHILIP CARRINGTON, Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Quebec

*'Aries the Ram at the top of the arch  
Begins his career in the cold month of March.'*

### § I

In my book *The Meaning of the Revelation* I have been forced to neglect unduly the light which can be thrown on the study of our Apocalypse by the mythology of the period. My only object in writing the book was to expound the meaning of its symbolic visions; and I do not think the study of Greek-Semitic myth contributes much to our understanding of the meaning. The meaning is governed almost entirely by Jewish-Christian conceptions. A study of the Old Testament (especially Ezekiel) and a study of the New Testament (especially the prophecies of Jesus) make clear the main outlines, which are not hard to grasp once it has been realised that its central event (chapters 17 and 18) is the destruction of Jerusalem, which was also the main theme of Ezekiel and of our Lord. The whole Apocalypse can be summed up in the words, "Destroy this temple which is made with hands, and in three days I will build another not made with hands."

Yet the symbolism, though not the meaning of the symbolism, does show traces of enrichment from mythical sources, and the study of these sources helps us to understand how the symbols were built up. Only in a very small measure do they assist us in discovering the meaning.

For some time past it has been fashionable to illustrate the Apocalypse from the Jewish eschatological literature of the period; in Dr. Charles' great commentary the contemporary apocalypses are made to solve all the mysteries. But it is becoming more and more obvious that the devotees of the "apocrypha and pseudepigrapha" have been concerning themselves with the

third-rate products of contemporary Jewish thought, and in consequence have evolved for themselves a reduced and warped type of Judaism which they call the "eschatological background" of the New Testament. It is not in reality the faith of the best Jews, nor is it the view of any New Testament writer, certainly not the author of the Apocalypse.

There were other Jewish circles in which a similar cycle of symbols was handled in a very different manner; only they have left no literature. Traces of them are to be found in the Rabbinic tradition, and in a hundred odd sects; they called themselves the "wise" or the "spiritual" or the "knowing ones" (gnostics); and they were ancestors of the Gnostic heresies of the second century. Some of them worshipped the Serpent instead of Jehovah, and St. John has these in mind when he speaks of the synagogue of Satan who call themselves Jews and are not. They took over the full Western Asiatic cycle of religious symbolism, and developed out of it a "higher" religion, sometimes of a universalist character, and occasionally antagonistic to the law and the priesthood. This is "the stream of Jewish gnosis which must have permeated the 'unofficial' Jewish piety in increasing strength ever since the exile" (E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*).

For some time, critics have been pointing out the affinities between the Apocalypse and various heathen myths; the importance of Lohmeyer's commentary is that it illustrates the Apocalypse from world-mythology without sacrificing its unity of structure and authorship; for even if pre-existing literary material has been worked into it by its present author (which is possible but unlikely) it is, as it stands, the work of one supreme creative imagination.

It is made more possible to do this when we realise that it is not a question of "borrowing" from Persian, or Babylonian, or Egyptian sources. The same mythological figures are found everywhere; every nation has its queen of heaven, its holy birth, its hero who fights the dragon, its descent into hades, its return into the upper world. The figures are all equivalent; Ishtar is



Venus, and Adonis-Tammuz is Osiris. Any figure may be credited with any action in the drama; either the hero or the queen of heaven may descend into the underworld; it may even be the queen of heaven who kills the dragon. Nothing is fixed or stable. The beautiful and highly-coloured figures move in a poetic dream-world of fancy. They may be applied to illustrate any "meaning"; any "meaning" may be deduced from them. The more manifold the meanings and the wider the application, the better. The queen of heaven may be the earth-mother, the life-spirit, the corn-maiden, or the regent of hell.

The queen of heaven becomes in Jewish gnosis Israel-Jerusalem, the bride of Jehovah,—or wisdom, or the Holy Spirit; the hero is Jehovah himself, or Michael, or the Messiah, or the son of man; the dragon is Satan, or the principle of evil, or the godless heathen empire. In St. John the queen of heaven is the Holy Spirit animating the holy community (the bride, Israel, the Church); the hero is Christ (the lamb, Michael, the son of man); the dragon is the principle of evil which gives power to the Roman empire and the divine emperor. St. John is simply taking the accepted well-known figures of myth and consecrating and transforming them for Christian purposes. In doing this he hardly writes a line which cannot be illustrated from the Old Testament; for traces of the mythology run all through the Old Testament.

He has in mind two other applications of the mythology which it is necessary for him to oppose; first, the perverted "Ophite" version, in which Jehovah is the enemy, and the serpent is the divine mind, the only-begotten son of the high God; the second is the imperial version in which the emperor is the divine hero, fighting against discord and poverty, and bringing in the new age of peace.

The deep spiritual meaning of St. John's visions is drawn by Christian faith from the prophecies of the Old Testament and of the gospels; these are convictions not to be found in the surrounding nations at all, the righteousness of the almighty eternal God, the sure judgment upon sin and injustice, even upon un-



faithful Jerusalem, the power of the naked unarmed truth, the triumph that lies in witness unto death. But the symbols in which these deep convictions are clothed, their loveliness, their colour, and their detail, are merely one form of the universal symbolism of the universal mythology of the day; and as they take form in the sunlight of the age of syncretism, they assume of necessity its colour and its style.

It is a delicate and perhaps an impossible task, therefore, to trace back details of his symbolism to sources other than the prophets, the temple ritual, and the gospel: as difficult as it is to trace the mutual borrowings of the mystery cults. If the twelve tribes, for instance, ever had a lunar or zodiacal meaning, it had long been forgotten before St. John wrote, and has contributed nothing to him. On the other hand the four living things do appear to be modelled on the four Babylonian guardians of the "corners of the earth"; but this assimilation of Babylonian material was originally made by Ezekiel from whom St. John took it; and even Ezekiel "syncretised" it with the earlier Palestinian cherubs or seraphs found in Isaiah and earlier. It is certain, however, that St. John was conscious enough of their Babylonian significance to maintain and develop it, and even, as I shall suggest below, to make them play their part in his drama in the astrological mode.

The astrological elements in the Apocalypse have been studied by F. Boll in his *Aus der Offenbarung Johannes* and Boll's views have been recommended to English readers by Professor F. C. Burkitt in his article on the Revelation in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. A purely astrological explanation of the Apocalypse or of any part of it is repugnant to common sense. Pure astrological doctrine holds that our lives are absolutely determined by the movements of the stars; and the author of the Apocalypse did not believe that. Supposing that in chapter 12 he incorporated four verses which were intended to have an astrological meaning, it is impossible to think that he recognised it. It is simply that the astral symbolism appealed to him as good symbolism for what he had to say. In any case the connection be-

tween the constellations and the figures of his myth was made long before; he could not take the myth without the astral associations.

The mother in heaven, the man-child, and the dragon, at once suggest the constellations of Virgo and Hydra (so close together) and perhaps Orion; but this suggestion adds nothing to our understanding of the vision. It is the Old Testament which really explains what St. John meant by it. The mother is the second Eve, the bride of Jehovah, the daughter of Zion; her child is the messiah who is to rule all nations with a rod of iron. It is difficult to see how the reference to the stars is going to help one any further. The Dragon is the personification of the powers of evil, which we have seen before in chapter 8; when we are told that his tail dragged down a third part of the stars, the number at once identifies him with Abaddon and his locust-army, whose power was in their tails, and by whom a third part of mankind were killed.

Boll refers this vision to a celestial birth of the messiah before creation; Lohmeyer refers it to an eschatological birth at the end of the world. Neither seems so satisfactory as the plain simple reference to the birth of Christ and of Christianity in time.

The truth is that in adopting this symbolism the astral references were unavoidable. Every nation of the ancient world had its myth of a queen of heaven, of the birth of a hero, and of his fight with a monster; and there are traces of evidence that the Jews were no exception to the rule, though Isaiah 7 is its only canonical expression. Every nation which was familiar with Babylonian astrology must have seen that myth gloriously blazoned in the skies, and thus given it universal significance. In using the myth of Isaiah 7 to symbolise the birth of Christ and of Christianity, St. John did not hesitate to provide the church with a Christian queen of heaven, a Christian hero, and a Christian victory over the powers of evil.

But his *debt* to astral religion is nil. References to Genesis 1 and Isaiah 7 help us to understand why he wrote this chapter,

and what he meant by it; references to astrology merely heighten the grandeur and universal scope of the symbolism.

The same considerations apply to such discoveries as that there is an altar in Revelation, and a constellation Ara in the heavens.<sup>1</sup> It recalls Fluellen's comparison between Monmouth and Macedon: "There is a river in Macedon; and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth; it is called Wye at Monmouth; but it is out of my brains what is the name of the other river; but 'tis all one, 'tis alike as my fingers is to my fingers, and there is salmons in both."

When we connect the altar of Revelation with the temple-ritual, or with the thought of martyrdom, we find the visions are at once filled with deep significance; and added significance is the real test of any theory. The reference to the constellation Ara adds nothing.

I now propose to draw attention to certain passages where a reference to the stars does seem to add something.

## § 2

If you were to run round the earth following the line of the equator, you would have the sun more or less above you all the time; more or less, because it would sometimes wander north to shed sunshine on the northern summer, and it would sometimes wander south to shed sunshine on the southern summer. Its farthest north point is the "tropic" (turning point) of Cancer; its farthest south point is the tropic of Capricorn. The sun, therefore, keeps to a well-defined broad track in the heavens, which makes a belt over the equator, corresponding exactly to the "Tropic Zone." This broad belt is called the zodiac.

If you stopped running when night came, and looked up at the zodiac, you would see that it was itself in motion, for all the stars rise in the east and sweep over to the west, the whole sky apparently turning. We are dealing with appearances we must remember, and appearances as they were in the ancient world.

If you ran up to the North Pole and stood there, you would

<sup>1</sup> But the altar in the Revelation does not appear to be in the heavens.

see above your head a star which never moved; it remains fixed in the sky with all the other stars revolving round it. It is visible everywhere in the northern hemisphere, but only at the Pole is it overhead. It is the heavenly North Pole; the zodiac is the heavenly Tropic Zone.

If you were a keen observer, you would note that the position of the sun was not fixed. Every night it has moved a little way along the zodiac. At the end of a year it has gone round to where it began. You would also note certain other stars which were not fixed, but circled more or less along the same track; they are the Moon, Venus, and Mercury, the latter always close to the sun. Three other wandering stars circled much more freely through the heavens; they are Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. These six wandering stars, together with the Sun, made up the ancient system of seven "planets" (wanderers).

The zodiac is divided into twelve equal segments called "houses," and these houses are named as follows: Ram, Ox, Twins, Crab, Lion, Virgin, Balances, Scorpion, Archer, Goat, Water-Carrier, Fishes. The sun passes into each house in turn, remaining there a month. At its farthest north it is in Crab (Cancer) and this is the northern midsummer; at its farthest south it is in Goat (Capricorn) and this is the northern mid-winter. In between there are the two "equinoxes" when the sun is exactly over the equator, and day and night are equal.

Please draw a square on a piece of paper, and mark its points North, East, South, and West. In astrology the course of the sun was thought of as square even when it was known to be circular. At the Eastern point write March 25 and Ram. The sun starts its course at the spring equinox in Ram, and climbs through Ox and Twins to its northernmost point in Crab. Here it was thought to stop before it began to descend; mark the northern point, June 24 and Crab; this is the summer "solstice" (the sun stands). It then descends through Lion and Virgin into Balances (Sept. 25, the autumn equinox). It then descends through Scorpion and Archer to its southernmost point in Goat (Dec. 25, the winter solstice), where it turns upwards again through Water-Carrier and Fishes to Ram.

This diagram will help you to understand how much we have so far learned, and forms a symbol of the old space-time conception. It will also help you to see why creation is thought of as a square, and why Four is the number of creation in the Apocalypse. It explains the four corners of the earth, and the four winds. Wherever Four occurs in the Apocalypse, it signifies creation and its laws, and all that goes on within it.

Twelve is also a key number in the Apocalypse. There are twelve houses in the zodiac, and these correspond roughly to the twelve months; roughly, even in our calendar, but very roughly indeed in the Babylonian calendar in which the months were lunar months, that is to say, the interval between one new moon and another. Twelve lunar months only make 360 days, so that the correspondence is inexact, and great error could and did creep in. The names of the Babylonian months are Nisan, Airu, Sivan, Tammuz, Ab, Elul, Tisri, Markesvan, Kisleu, Tebet, Sebat, and Adar. During Nisan the sun is in Ram, during Airu in Bull, and so on. Nisan is roughly March-April, and so on.

We can now construct a more ambitious diagram. Draw a circle, and divide it into four quarters, or quadrants, by two straight lines at right angles. Now divide the circumference of each quadrant into three; this gives twelve divisions in all. The circumference of the circle now represents the zodiac; write in the twelve names in order.

First quadrant: Ram, Bull, Twins.

Second quadrant: Crab, Lion, Virgin.

Third quadrant: Balances, Scorpion, Archer.

Fourth quadrant: Goat, Water-Carrier, Fishes.

Add the names of the months, both the Babylonian and the English; and you have enough astrological knowledge to illuminate a great deal of the Revelation.

*The Four Zoa.* In the midst of the throne of God in Revelation 4 are Four Living Things, the "Cherubim" of Ezekiel, and the winged genii of Babylonian art. Each has a different face: (1) Lion, (2) Bull, (3) Man, (4) Eagle. Lion and Bull you

can easily find on your diagram. Man is Water-Carrier. Eagle is substituted for Scorpion because Scorpion has a bad meaning; it is the most unlucky of all the houses; it is the house of death. The Eagle is a constellation close by, and is used instead. The Babylonian name for the Scorpion-month (Markesvan) merely means "eighth month," and shows the same reluctance to name the scorpion.

If you have marked these on the diagram, you will see that each one is the middle sign of its quadrant; they are, in fact, the four cardinal points of the compass, which symbolise all creation. The same symbolism is intended in another way by their manifold heads, wings, eyes (stars), etc., and the song which they sing. They signify all creation including man.

St. John derives them from Ezekiel, who appears to have derived them from the eagle-headed, bull-headed, man-headed, and lion-headed genii with many wings, with which archæology has made us all familiar. They are said to be Nebo, Nergal, Marduk, and Ninib, the astral gods of the four corners of the earth. One might suppose that only a dim reflection of their original astral significance would remain; but further investigation suggests that St. John was making deliberate use of it.

In chapter 6 we come to the celebrated Four horsemen; and each rider comes out in response to a command from one of the Four living things. Each horseman has a colour and a symbolic object; it will make it clearer if you enter it on your diagram. Write the words Lion, Bull, Man, and Eagle in bold capital letters in their respective quadrants; under each name write the characteristics of the horses and their riders.

- |           |                       |               |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 1. Lion.  | White: Bow and Crown. |               |
| 2. Bull.  | Red: Sword.           | (War.)        |
| 3. Man.   | Black: Balances.      | (Famine.)     |
| 4. Eagle. | Green: Death.         | (Pestilence.) |

Let me pause to recall the meaning of the Four horsemen. They represent the progress of man and his empires through war, famine, and pestilence to the grave. It is an epitome of the



course of empire; "westward the course of empire takes its way." It is an outline of human history to date. Inordinate ambition is followed by red war and its other sequels. The cycle of human empire repeats itself over and over again. The white rider is simply man: he goes forth conquering and to conquer: he ends in hell. As an outline of history it is short, picturesque, and accurate; though maybe one-sided.

The Four living things represent the invisible laws of history according to which it all happens; God's logic and justice; those that take the sword perish by it.

I say this because the astral and mythical elements I am pointing out are not intended to be the *meaning* of the vision; they are only elements in the symbolism which blazons the meaning.

1. The Bow and the Crown are symbols of the sun god, Apollo or Mithras; the neighbouring month is Tammuz, the Syrian summer god (June-July); man is exhibited in his pride, glorying in all his virile faculties. In astrology this house is allotted to the sun.

2. The red rider is in the house of the Bull. In astrology it is allotted to Venus; but Ishtar, the Babylonian Venus, is goddess both of lust and war. The Sword symbolises both.

3. The black rider is in winter under the cold Water-Carrier. Famine and winter go naturally together. The Balance (which is the sign of another house) may suggest 'weighed and found wanting.' In astrology the house is allotted to the cold cruel malignant Saturn.

4. The green (pale A.V.) rider is in Scorpion (Eagle) the house of disaster, the house of death.

Now please note the all-important point. You have gone round the zodiac the wrong way: "widdershins" contrary to the sun. Man has reversed the course he should have taken and ended in death instead of life. He has ridden contrary to his destiny; he is undone.

Let us look at it the other way round. Let us start again in the house of the Lion and go the same way as the sun. We find ourselves at once following the natural course of man as sym-



bolised in the syncretised mythology of the age. In the house of the Lion, we start with Adonis, the lord of summer, the life of the world; we pass into the house of Scorpion, the season of autumn and death; we endure the winter of death in the house of the Water-Carrier, and rise again in the glorious spring-time in the house of the Bull. That which is symbolised (and no more) in the myth and ritual of Adonis was actually done by Christ, who is called by our author the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and is actually exhibited as a second rider on a white horse later in the book.

One more point. Christ is introduced to our notice in chapter 5 as the Lion; but we actually see him as the Lamb. The Lamb in apocalyptic is the fighting messiah; it is hard here not to see some reference to the Ram, which is the first sign of the zodiac. The unusual word Arnion used by St. John seems to be a form of the word actually used by astrologers for the Ram (Aries or Arnum) and his month (March) is allotted to Mars (Ares in Greek), the god of war.

The Lamb in St. John has also a sacrificial meaning, and in particular alludes to the Lamb sacrificed at the passover which took place in March-April (Nisan), the month of the Ram, the opening month of the Babylonian year. There is a suggestion, therefore, of the birth of a new age, the beginning of a new zodiac, a new heaven and earth, "the acceptable year of the Lord."

*The Sixth Seal.*—The four riders are connected with the first four of seven seals, and symbolise the catastrophic course of human history; the sixth seal shows its final result, the smash of the cosmos, the obliteration of sun and moon, the wholesale fall of the stars.

The astral world of the Apocalypse is not the celestial universe of the astronomer; nor is it supposed, as in astrology, to influence and determine the human world; it *is* the human world. It is empires and religions and kings and gods that fall out of their heavens when sin has run its course and the crisis comes; and this is what all this symbolism means. Even now the world is strewn with fragments of the ancient civilisations, and we are, perhaps, preparing ourselves for the greatest downfall of all.

*The Twenty-Four Elders.*—The Twenty-Four Elders have never been traced successfully to an astral base. There is a mention in Diodorus Siculus of twenty-four Babylonian star gods, two to each house of the zodiac; but the number is not used in astrology or mythology. For purposes of astrology each house was subdivided into three "decanates," making 36 in all.

On the other hand their connection with the twenty-four priestly "courses" of the Jerusalem temple is obvious and illuminating; for these elders represent humanity on its kingly and priestly side offering worship to God.

*The Twelve Tribes.*—The number Twelve, however, naturally connects itself with the zodiac and the months of the year; it suggests at once the twelve signs of the zodiac in their choric "torch-dance" around the earth, and the twelve months, or children of the moon. It is quite probable that the tribes of Israel were originally grouped into the number twelve because of its lunar significance; but if so, the connection was so ancient as to mean very little to St. John. To him Twelve is the number of the whole people of God, and represents the full number of all who shall be united with him in Christ. Twelve (or 144) signifies therefore the church.

Attempts have been made to connect the names of the Twelve tribes with the signs of the zodiac. In some cases a clear case can be made out; in others the connection is not so easily seen. The following is the list of A. Jeremias (*Das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., p. 387):

Reuben: Water-Carrier.	Dinah: Virgin.
Simeon and Levi: Twins.	Gad: Archer.
Judah: Lion.	Assher: Fishes.
Zebulon: Goat.	Naphthali: Ram.
Issachar: Crab.	Joseph: Bull.
Dan: Balance.	Benjamin: Scorpion.

The identifications are based on Genesis 49. He also quotes from the Targum of Jonathan on Numbers 2 an identification of the four cardinal signs.

Reuben: Ox.	Dan: Eagle (Scorpion).
Judah: Lion.	Ephraim: Man (Water-Carrier).

This is not the place to discuss the unusual order and selection of the tribes in the Apocalypse (Rev. 7); but we may note that neither Dan nor Ephraim is there. Dan unquestionably symbolised evil; hence its connection with Scorpion in the Targum, and its omission in our Apocalypse.

If the tribes had a zodiacal meaning for St. John, it ought to become apparent when we write them in a circle in his order. There are four possible ways of doing this. We may write them in the order of the present text or in the order as amended by Buchanan Gray and adopted by Charles (1.207); we may write them consecutively, or in the order East, North, South, West suggested by Rev. 21.13; in no case do our four cardinal points emerge. It is an odd fact that in every case the four points which ought to be cardinal are all grouped together (Judah, Reuben, Joseph, Benjamin). We may deduce that if St. John suspected any zodiacal meaning in the names of the tribes, he wished to suppress it.

The same is suggested by Dr. Charles' discovery about the twelve precious stones which form the foundations of the holy city, and symbolise the twelve apostles. These stones are each connected with a zodiacal sign, but are arranged in the reverse order. This suggests strongly that he wished to exclude an astral meaning. It will be remembered that the order of the Four living things was also reversed.

The holy city represents a new creation. The number Twelve is used, but the old zodiacal meaning with its heathen suggestions is excluded. We might notice here that the number Four, which was the number of the old creation, re-appears in the cubic shape of the city.

*The Woes.*—The three woes of chapter 9 are introduced by the vision of an Eagle in the "Mesouranema," which means in astrology the portion of the heavens visible above the earth. If the Eagle stands for the Scorpion, then there may well be an astral element in the symbolism; for the house of the scorpion is the eighth house, the house of death. The Eagle heralds the three woes with their locusts and demonic cavalry which have

power to hurt mankind with the "torment of a scorpion." Their meaning is the deadly power of sin over all mankind, culminating in mental torture and the ruin of the soul. "The wages of sin is death."

It is preceded by four trumpets which result in the destruction of a third part of the universe; that is to say the partial ruin of all mankind, the destruction wrought by sin. They enshrine the fall of a star called Wormwood which embitters the sweet waters of earth. The fall of the star is a form of the myth of the fall of man (or of the angels?). No astral symbolism seems to illuminate this passage.

*The Eighth Beast.*—The beast (the Roman Empire) has seven horns which represent the seven Caesars from Augustus to Titus; "and the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven and goeth to destruction."

The eighth out of seven is an abnormality which ordinary mathematics does not permit; it was necessary however if St. John was to introduce Domitian the successor of Titus. It suggests also an element of the monstrous in his appearance; he is an abortion. Two things may be noted about him.

1. He is the eighth; and in astrology the eighth house (Scorpion) spells disaster. He ends the series in disaster and death. And it is worth nothing that with Domitian we do see the end of an atmosphere of horror and menace which had enveloped the Julian and Flavian Caesars.

2. He is Nero returned from the abyss. The beast "was and is not and shall ascend out of the abyss and go into perdition"; one of its heads was "as if wounded unto death, and its deadly wound was healed." Each of these statements, one from chapter 13 and one from chapter 17, is followed by the further statement that the world "wondered" at the beast.

Let me, before I point out the mythological elements which may be contained in these verses, remind the reader of the meaning which underlies the symbolism. First, there is a general meaning; the world-empire crashes, but reconstitutes itself in another form and carries on; there is a succession of "beasts" as in Daniel, but all are forms of the one world-empire which is

informed with the spirit of the serpent and is therefore the enemy of God. Secondly, there may be a historical allusion, perhaps originally to the deadly sickness from which Caligula (an individual emperor or "head") recovered: or more likely to the suicide of Nero (one of the heads), a mortal blow under which the whole empire (the beast) staggered, though it recovered after a year of civil war.

The general meaning is, however, the essential meaning of the symbolism; the evil world-empire is an undying self-renewing monster; Persia succeeds Babylon; Rome succeeds Syria; Domitian succeeds Nero. The beast may be slain; the dragon who gave him his power and great authority remains; and the beast revives.

Is it not possible that the symbolism in which this is blazoned owes something to the Adonis-Tammuz myth and the descent into hades? The beast descends into the abyss and rises again; he "was and is not and shall ascend"; he dies and rises again. May not this have been the basis of the popular belief that Nero would return; Nero as Adonis-Tammuz? We suspected traces of this myth when we plotted the four living things and the four horsemen on the astrological diagram of the zodiac. The white horseman is Sol Invictus; the four horsemen are the four horses of the sun-chariot; they drive widdershins round the heavens, and end in the eighth house, the house of death. The contrary direction would have given us the course of the sun and the regular Adonis-Tammuz myth of death and resurrection.

Now in this horoscope, it is the course of human empire which is plotted for us; but it is not till we reach the second half of the Apocalypse that it becomes clear that St. John has the Roman Empire specifically in mind. The popular myth of the returning Nero has suggested to us the Adonis-Tammuz motive; is there anything further to connect the house of the Caesars and the empire of Rome with this legend? I would ask the reader to return to the zodiac diagram.

The white horseman in the house of Lion falls opposite the month Ab, though we connected it in our exposition with the previous month Tammuz (= Adonis); it will be remembered

that the houses of the zodiac and the months of the year only roughly correspond; Ab however was dedicated to Nergal by the Babylonians, and Nergal is the Lion cherub. The various astral systems fail exactly to coincide; the confusion is made worse by the "precession of the equinoxes" which means that each group of stars has shifted forward since ancient times and now occupies the next house. What we get however is something like this.

Fourth house: Crab. Month-name Tammuz = June-July: Babylonian god Nergal = Lion-god: allotted in astrology to the moon. House of the summer solstice.

Fifth house: Lion. Month-name Ab = July-August: connected in the Apocalypse with the rider on the white horse: allotted in astrology to the sun.

Now two months were deliberately connected with the Caesars. The fifth Roman month, Quintilis, was named July after Julius Caesar.

The sixth Roman month, Sextilis, was named August after Augustus, the first emperor, and the first of St. John's seven heads.

Now the sixth house is Virgo and is connected in astrology with Mercury; it is unnecessary to produce the well-known references in Horace and Vergil, in the one case to Mercury and Apollo, in the other to the Virgin who brings to birth the New Age. It is a fact of history that the widespread myth of the queen of heaven, the birth of the hero, the fight with the dragon, and the introduction of the golden age had been associated widely with the figure of Augustus ultimately made lord of the sixth house. This might be an additional reason for St. John's production of a Christian version of the myth; it might supply a further reason for the adoption of the number six as the "number of the beast," and it is at least interesting that the personal name of Augustus (Octavianus) carries in it the fatal number eight (octavus). It must also be remembered that the sixth house, now named Augustus and thus dedicated to the beast, is close to the constellation Draco or serpent which in St. John represents the power of evil which gives the beast its power and authority.



The Julian month corresponds to the house of the Lion which is allotted in astrology to the sun; in practise however it would often overlap the Babylonian fourth month Tammuz (= Adonis) allotted in astrology to the moon, and dedicated in Babylon to the lion-faced Nergal. The moon, of course, is Ishtar the warlike Babylonian Venus; when Tammuz the summer-god died, and went down during the winter months into hades, Ishtar followed him and brought him back from the dead. Now Julius Caesar was also connected with Venus; his descent from Venus was taken very seriously; he was the child of Venus, just as Adonis-Tammuz was child as well as lover of Ishtar (= Venus). Does not the appropriation of the fifth month claim this identification? Julius Caesar, like Adonis-Tammuz, was cut off tragically in the climax of his power (when the sun had reached its highest point); but he too was a child of Ishtar-Venus, and therefore he may rightly be credited with a resurrection to new life. Whether this thought would find sufficient expression in his deification; or whether he was thought of as returning from death in his successors who bore his name; or whether an actual return was looked for, it would be perhaps difficult to say.

Unquestionably I have indulged in an enormous amount of conjecture here; but the fact remains that the location of Julius Caesar in the fifth house does connect him with Adonis-Tammuz, and both figures are connected with Venus-Ishtar. Venus-Ishtar is of course the "bright and morning star"; and this star is twice claimed for Christ in the Revelation (2.28 and 22.16).

*Conclusion.*—Astral elements do seem to enter into the symbolism of the Apocalypse, though they do not determine its meaning; they are not even essential to the understanding of its meaning; they are a subsidiary element of the mythical symbolism, which is itself subsidiary to Jewish prophetic and liturgical symbolism.

There is no astral system running through the Apocalypse unless we can say that St. John visualises creation under its four quadrants,<sup>2</sup> neglecting more or less the twelve houses.

<sup>2</sup> The four corners of the earth.

## THE ANGEL OF PEACE—URIEL—METATRON

By CHAIM KAPLAN, Brooklyn

The Book of Enoch has exerted a strong influence upon Jewish mysticism. Many of the most basic principles of the Cabbala (*e.g.* the relative position of the archangels, the significance of the 42-letter name that is connected with the holy name E H J E, the northern paradise) are traceable to their Enochic antecedents. In the following we shall endeavor to explain one of the most important features of the Enochic angelology which is also very prominent in the Cabbala: the term "angel of peace" that is used in the Similitudes for the angel accompanying Enoch on his heavenly journey (chs. xl. 8, lii. 5, liv. 4, lvi. 2).

A study of angelology is useful inasmuch as it gives us an insight into the religious ideas reflected in the popular conceptions about the angels. A better understanding of the angelology of the pre-Christian period is of particular interest to the student of early Christianity who seeks to discover the sources and to trace the development of Christian Theology. As we shall see later, the popular views associated with the figures of the angel of peace and Metatron form the background of many ideas so current in the N. T.

Evidently, the angel of peace is the mediator between heaven and earth. In this capacity he raises the earthly man to heaven and introduces him to all the celestial secrets. Enoch, it seems, stands in need of such a protector. We should only recall the idea prevalent in Jewish lore that the celestial inhabitants do not readily welcome human beings to their midst. Their plot against Adam, their opposition to Moses are well known. In 3 Enoch (chs. 4, 6) Enoch himself is met with disfavor by the heavenly host when Anpiel brings him up to heaven. We note that in 1 Enoch LX, 10-11 the angel of peace is contrasted with "the

other angel" in that the latter grudges knowledge of secret things to Enoch whereas the former gives it freely.

Thus, peace is to be understood in the sense of a connecting link or right balance between heaven and earth. Indeed, rabbinics abound in references to "peace" in the same manner. Midrash Hagadol I, 1, 25: "and the Lord concluded (creation) with man, for he resembles peace, being the right balance between the higher and the lower world."<sup>1</sup> Seder Rabbi Ishmael: "the angels that descend to make peace in the world"; YR I<sup>280</sup>: the angels of God ascending and descending (in Jacob's dream) are the angels of peace."

Baer identifies the angel of peace with Uriel. Indeed, the Cabbala generally designates Uriel by the name of the "prince of peace" ("Sar Shalom"). Uriel, furthermore, is the *Machriâ* (balance) between the two opposites, Michael and Gabriel. In later mysticism the name of "Amuda d'emsaita" (middle column) is given to Uriel who, as we shall see by and by, was identified with the most important angelic figure—Metatron.

As I have shown elsewhere, Uriel is identified with Phannel not only in the Similitudes but also in the Cabbala. A compound form Urpaniel is very extant in mystical writings. In Tikkunim Urpaniel is equated with Metatron. It should be noted that in the Similitudes Phannel occupies a middle position between Michael and Gabriel, "right" and "left," and is placed at the front of the divine presence. In this sense he is *the* "angel of the presence" in a special manner, since he is "facing" the Lord.<sup>2</sup> The identification of Uriel-Phannel-Metatron, functioning as a mediator between heaven and earth, right and left, will be made evident in the light of the following discussion.

Metatron is treated at length in the Cabbala. He is the central point of a whole system describing the unfolding process taking place in two directions—right and left—of the all-permeating, all-penetrating, all-embracing divine principle. The unfolding

<sup>1</sup> Cf. GeR<sup>12</sup>, LeR<sup>9</sup>: "his soul from above, his body from below"; 2 Enoch xxx. 10, "from visible and invisible."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lekah Tob II<sup>72</sup>: "and the angel of His presence saved them—the angel who beholds the face (= panim)."

process is followed by its reverse—the converging process. The point of convergence corresponds to the point of divergence; thus, Metatron in whom the opposites meet is regarded as the true representative of the deity as a unifying, pacifying and reconciling principle in the multitudinousness of mutually exclusive and antagonistic existences. Accordingly, he is the *μεσότης*. He is accorded a higher place than Michael and Gabriel just as Mythra is superior to both Ormuza and Ahriman for the reason that he expresses more fully the essence of the supreme deity of which both rival powers are but partial representations. In this connection Metatron is elevated to be the embodiment of the Shekina (YR II<sup>113</sup>), for as is well known, the Shekina as conceived by the Cabbala stands for the Sephira of Tifereth (= harmony) in which the higher Sephiroth “Hesed” and “Gebura” (mercy and rigid judgment) attain their full realization.

This view of Metatron as the mediator is made in the Cabbala a favorite subject for manifold imagery. The different aspects of his meditorial character are given in mystical writings.

Uriel-Metatron is represented as the eagle flying between heaven and earth, or, as the legendary, gigantic bird whose feet rest in water, whose head reaches up to heaven. He is symbolized by “Ruah” in its two designations—physical “wind” (medium element between fire and water) and “spirit” (mid-way between the higher and the lower souls). He is identified with the firmament separating the higher from the lower waters. He is the ladder of Jacob's dream linking heaven and earth. He is the prince of the “world of formation,” occupying an intermediate position between Akathriel, the prince of the “world of creation,” and Sandalfon, the prince of the “world of action.”<sup>3</sup> As a formative agency he is charged with transforming the manna from a spiritual essence into a physical substance (cf. John vi. 32, where the “bread of life” is contrasted with manna, the embodied Logos being that very bread of life). He is, further, placed in a middle position between mercy and judgment: in this

<sup>3</sup> Creation, formation, action stand for the divine thought, word and act, respectively.

capacity he is set over the middle stratum of human beings—those who are neither wholly righteous nor wholly wicked—to accept their repentance.

In the last particular the similarity between Phannel of the Similitudes and Metatron is striking. In Enoch xl. 9 Phannel is described as standing between Michael, the champion of the righteous and Gabriel who executes punishment on the wicked, Phannel himself being set over repentance.

The etymology of the word Metatron is rather doubtful. Many derivations have been proposed, some of them very fanciful. Such combinations as *μετὰ θρόνος*, *μετατήρρανος* were popular with the writers who were inclined to see in Metatron a "lesser god," a being sharing with the Almighty the rule over the world. Arguments are drawn from 3 Enoch, where Metatron is represented as sitting on a throne like his master, also from Chagiga 15<sup>a</sup> where Ahar is said to have seen Metatron "seated" which fact led Ahar to believe in a second power co-equal with God.

However, 3 Enoch is a creation of the Gaonic period and represents a later stage of the Metatron conception. The passage in Chagiga merely says that Ahar saw Metatron seated on high where no sitting is permissible. No trace of an enthroned arch-angel is found in the authoritative sources. A second throne presupposes a hierarchy which is foreign to Judaism and could not have found a place in the Talmudic circles. The absence of a hierarchy in the writing representing the views of "normal Judaism" makes the idea of a vice-regent preposterous. Ahar's explanation of the sitting of Metatron as denoting a second power is to be regarded as a reflection of Gnostic views.

The real significance of the Metatron idea comes to light, however, by tracing it back to the pseudepigraphic literature and the earlier rabbinic writings.

What are the functions of Metatron according to the Talmud? He is the angel of revelation calling on Moses to ascend Mount Sinai,<sup>4</sup> teaching young children the law of God;<sup>5</sup> he is the angel

<sup>4</sup> Sanhedrin 38<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Aboda Zona 3<sup>b</sup>.

going before the camp of Israel; <sup>6</sup> he is the heavenly scribe writing the merits of Israel.<sup>7</sup> These traits are reminiscent of the angel of the Lord so prominent in the Book of Jubilees—the angel of the presence going before the camp of Israel who is entrusted with the writings and the decrees inscribed in the heavenly tables, who calls on Moses to ascend the mount and instructs him in the law. The close correspondence between the two descriptions points to the conclusion that the two conceptions are congruent. Metatron, therefore, is to be derived from Metator—precursor, leader in battle, or *the messenger of the Lord par excellence*.

Professor Moore (*Intermediaries* 76) assumes that Metatron is an appellative for Michael, the prince of Israel. It seems, however, that primarily he was not identified with one specific angel. In the older sources Gabriel, rather than Michael, is performing the functions enumerated above. Gabriel is the angel of revelation, the one who transmits heavenly knowledge to mortals (Dan. 9). In Enoch, too, the angel entrusted with the books is the angel of the Sword (see Enoch lxxxviii. 2: "drew his sword"; lxxxix. 4, xc. 22: he gives the sword to the sheep). In rabbinics, likewise, the traditional scribe is Gabriel (TB Joma 77<sup>a</sup>, Sabbath 55<sup>a</sup>, Megilla 16, Eicha Rabba 2). In later writings Gabriel as the prince of hosts is contrasted with Michael the high-priest (YR I<sup>34, 100</sup>; III<sup>10, 47</sup>). The angel of the Lord is variously identified by the rabbis with Michael or Gabriel (ExR<sup>2</sup>).

As we have seen, the Cabbala identifies Metatron with Uriel. But already in the Zadokite Work the angel of the Lord who combats the adversary is called "the prince of Lights"—Uriel. This circumstance lends weight to the theory that Metatron is derived from Metator and is the leader of the host of the Lord. The fusion of Metatron with Uriel can be traced through later rabbinic literature. In Ps. Jon. Deut. 34 Metatron appears to be the equivalent of Uriel, Jephphiah, Zangazael—the angels of wisdom or revelation.<sup>8</sup> Cf. NuR<sup>3</sup>: Uriel corresponds to the holy

<sup>6</sup> Sanhedrin 38<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Chagiga 15<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> In Enoch x. 1, Uriel discloses the future to Noah, informing him of the coming flood.



scriptures; PR "10 commandments": the Torah was given in the month whose name is Uriel (Sivan = zivan: the shining, light bringing month). Both Metatron and Uriel are regarded as heavenly scribes. In 1 Enoch xxx. 4, lxviii., Uriel is said to have written down the laws of the motions of the heavenly bodies; in 2 Enoch Uretil (a corruption of Uriel) is entrusted with the secret books; while in PS. Jon. Gen. 5<sup>24</sup> Metatron bears the name of "great scribe."

By association of ideas the angel of the Lord came to be regarded as the chief of the heavenly hosts—the luminaries. Thus, Metatron is set over the hosts of heaven (YR I<sup>13</sup>) in the same manner as Uriel in Enoch xxxiii.—xxxvi., lxxii.—lxxxii. In Daniel viii. 10, 11 the prince of the host is the commander of the stars; Antiochus is said to have thrown down some of the stars of heaven and to have magnified himself up to the prince of the host. In this connection, the Angel of the Lord is represented as the chief of the lights leading them in battle against the powers of darkness, evil and iniquity. Cf. Zadokite Work where the "Prince of the Lights" (= Uriel) is said to make war on Beliar. The contest between Israel and his enemies assumed cosmic proportions and was enacted into a drama of a universal strife between the forces of the Lord and the Satanic, destructive agencies. Undoubtedly, Persian influences have to be considered.<sup>9</sup>

The identification of Enoch with Metatron found in later sources (PS. Jon. Gen. 5<sup>24</sup>, 3 Enoch) is, probably, due to the Uriel-Metatron equation. Already in Enoch Uriel and Enoch are both agents of revelation (lxviii. note that in xxxiii. 4 Uriel writes the laws of the heavenly bodies, whole in xxxiii. 3 it is Enoch himself). The Cabbala has preserved traces of this identification: YR I<sup>18</sup>: Enoch is the same as Muriel (a variety of Uriel).

The authoritative sources sought to diminish the importance of

<sup>9</sup> The prince of the luminaries is also the "prince of the world" (3 Enoch xxxviii. 3)—an epithet of Metatron. Cf. 1 Enoch xx. 2: Uriel is over the world.

the angel of the Lord (Sanhedrin 38°). It is noteworthy that Uriel is as if carefully omitted in Talmudic and early Midrashic writings. Instead of the triad Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, so prominent in the Cabbala, the Talmud gives the triad of Michael, Gabriel, Rafael. Later Cabbala speculates about the conspicuous absence of Uriel from the Talmudic passages (YR I<sup>177-8</sup>). Evidently, Uriel is closely associated with heterodox views and has mythological affiliations; he was, therefore, rejected by the representatives of the synagogue, while he met with high favor among the syncretic circles which gave rise to the pseudepigraphic literature.

The Gnostics eagerly seized upon the mysterious, all-inclusive figure of Metatron and strove to bring it within the scope of their views (TB Chagiga 15°, Sanhedrin 38°). The logos theory, most popular with the heterodox sects, was brought into play. The angel serving as a mediator of divine manifestation and the carrier of the word was identified with the Logos.<sup>10</sup> Even some of the rabbis did not escape this mode of thought. Ben Azzai and Ben Zoma (who had predilection for mystical speculations: Chagiga 13°) said: "the voice of the Almighty was Metatron to Moses; on the waters" (GeR<sup>5</sup>).

The conception of the Angel of the Lord and the qualities ascribed to him contributed greatly to the formation of Christian Theology. Jesus is the leader in battle, the guardian of the seals and the books (Revelation); the word (John); the linking bond between heaven and earth, the divine and the human. Most important for Christian Theology was the role of the angel of the presence as the transmitter of revelation. That angel is supposed to have been instrumental in the giving of the law. He served, accordingly, as the mediator between the Lord and Moses: he revealed the secret decrees of heaven to Moses (Jubilees)—secrets not contained in the Pentateuch but transmitted orally in the esoteric circles of mystics who claimed prophetic powers. In those circles the law of Moses was not regarded as the sum-total

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Philo who calls the angel bearing the divine name (Ex. xxiii. 21) *λόγος θεῖος* (in *Quis rerum divin. haeres.* i 501, *De Migrat. Abrah.* i. 463).

of divine revelation. Revelations of equal importance were made to Enoch and Noah. The law is inscribed in the heavenly tables and is gradually revealed to the outstanding righteous: Moses is not the only recipient of the divine law. He is not the first law-giver and does not rank higher than his predecessors: he, as well as they, received his revelations through the angel of the presence. Why, then, suppose that the Mosaic law is the last, concluding, complete expression of the will of God? Do not the heavenly tables contain teachings not yet known, to be disclosed in the last days? The apoclyp waited for the coming of the Angel of the Lord, of the presence, the captain of the Lord's hosts, the angel of revelation or of the covenant<sup>11</sup> to lead Israel to victory, to usher in a new order of things, to make known secrets, to seal a new covenant. Those expectations prepared the way for Christianity and the glorification of Jesus as the messenger of the New Testament.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Malach: iii. I: the angel of the covenant.

<sup>12</sup> The apocrypho-pseudepigraphic literature forms a link between the Old and the New Testaments. The influence of that literature on early Christianity will, I hope, be treated at length in future articles.

## ADULT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By FREDERICK C. GRANT, Western Theological Seminary<sup>1</sup>

### I

It is fairly certain, within limitations, who are "adults." For practical purposes the word means persons of college age or over. But it is not so certain what education is, nor what religious education is.

(1) Technology is not education, but is a part of it, and may well become a basis for it. Many men have made it a starting-point for fuller education; one thinks of Herbert Hoover, the engineer, of Ford, of Ramsay MacDonald, of Edison, of Steinmetz, of Pupin. Such a technological beginning is fairly common and probably must be so, for many persons, in this technological age.

(2) Political life, public affairs, business experience, travel, wide contacts, knowledge of the world—none of these is education, but any one of them is a valuable supplement to it, and may be made a vital part of it; and indeed may be the starting-point of a thorough and extensive education.

(3) "Culture" alone is not education, but a part of it—and a highly valuable part. That it is not sufficient in itself is proved by the fact that there have been men of a certain kind of 'culture' who were socially irresponsible, lacking self-control and unable to take their part in the common life. This has been true of some of the highest examples of artistic and literary culture.

I really cannot think of a better definition than the one toward which Plato's mind worked steadily all his life—that is, it is 'harmony,' the harmonious activity of skilled and highly trained members under disciplined self-control, guided by a dominating

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered at the Mid-Winter Banquet of the Alumni of the Episcopal Theological School, at the University Club in Boston, February 11, 1931.

purpose, and contemplating the highest ends: devotion to truth, beauty, and goodness.

(4) If this is so, *i.e.*, if we too are working in the right direction, it is evident that religion—or religious education—is not the whole of education (though it *has* been proposed at times as a substitute for culture, for social experience and enthusiasm, for the private business of living, and for all that is meant by education generally); nor is it a thing apart and distinguishable from education; but it is a *part* of education—albeit the noblest and most indispensable part—of education as a whole. And it too, like technology or culture—*e.g.*, art or music, public affairs, professional life—may be made the starting point of a full, rich education. That is to say, for its full development, for the full realization of its capacities and meanings, Religious Education requires as its setting and accompaniment a thoroughly rounded, complete, and effective general education—if you will allow the term, a thorough ‘humanistic’ education. In its most effective form, as we may see by suggestion and anticipation from certain periods and areas in the past, religion is the very heart of a definite and distinctive type of human culture, which we are now trying to extend or create; and religious education is the process by which it is furthered, nurtured, extended, reinforced, unfolded, and conserved.

The ‘general situation’ in education and culture, in our times, sets the conditions for our task. Indeed, it makes our task harder, in some respects, easier in others, than was the task of religious education in other periods. In the days of the Puritan Commonwealth, here in New England; in England in the days of Queen Anne; in most Roman Catholic countries up to the last generation—religious education was a comparatively simple matter. People absorbed their religion principally from the surrounding society. Methods were not very complex—any method would do: Bible reading, the Catechism (Anglican or Puritan or Roman Catholic), the ‘sacramental system,’ public worship—these were enough. But today all this is changed—there is no one common social structure and background, no consensus in

religion or politics, or anything else, no agreed and recognized principles of social or personal behavior. Not only is religion dissociated from its accompanying and traditional *mores*, its standards for social and personal living, and from any commonly recognized and therefore authoritative outlook upon the world and upon human endeavor and destiny—not only this, with its resultant weakening of the ‘hold’ of religion upon everyday life; but some there are—like Professor Barnes—who even maintain that religion is inimical to social welfare and progress. It is a truism, perhaps a platitude, to say that this makes our task *harder*, and demands our fullest devotion to its accomplishment; what I wish to point out is that, whether it increases our difficulties or not, this ‘general situation’ certainly sets the conditions of our task. In brief, it is not a mere matter of improved methods, better techniques in administering or conducting religious education. It involves nothing short of a whole new set of goals and principles—in brief, the creation of a new kind of Christian culture, in which modern science and philosophy shall have their place, and the human values newly emerged in our present-day western world; and which at the same time holds firmly to those old values which lie close to the heart of the ancient and traditional religious outlook and which are forever valid, forever binding, and forever liberating. Fortunately, we are not required to create a new religion! What is demanded, however, is a new synthesis of religion and culture, of religion and ethics, of religion and the common world-view, *i.e.*, the world-outlook toward which modern science and philosophy and modern social and personal idealism are steadily converging.

Now I think most of us are agreed upon this—although we fail to take it sufficiently seriously, and to realize quite how far the quest will take us. For example, the ‘Catholic’ looks back to an authoritative system of Christian doctrine and practice in the past; but he hopes to see it ‘restated’ in modern terms, and ‘applied’ to modern life—with whatever minor adjustments are needful by the way. The ‘Evangelical’ churchman likewise sees the perfect synthesis in the past—the gospel, spreading out to all



nations, purifying and redeeming the ancient world, and pressing on to the redemption and perfection of the souls of men in the present. The Golden Age of the good life is not sought in the past alone—but in the future: for the gospel is fundamentally an 'evangel' and a promise of good things to come. He too longs for the triumph of the good life—he calls it the victory of Christ, the consummation. Obviously that means a permeation of society with the Christ-spirit—a transformation of the common life by the life set forth in the Gospel. And that means a union of religion and culture. Finally, the 'Modernist'—to take one more type—sees with wide-open eyes the steady, uninterrupted and inevitable flow of development and shift of emphasis in religion, ethics, and culture generally today. But he is no disinterested spectator; he has his hopes and fears; he is a man of conviction and of faith; and he longs to see religion and common thought, faith and reason, devotion and science, Christian ethics and 'secular' idealism brought together, the breaches healed, and a strong, unified outlook set forth which will bring out the best in men, and lead to a new epoch in the world's cultural and religious history. We are all agreed; our common problem is, where to begin; and to solve that there is one still more fundamental, what are we striving for? For I think that, diverse as our outlooks are, 'Catholic,' 'Modernist,' 'Evangelical,' we shall find that the basic religious problem of our day is one that is common to us all; and one which may very likely bring us closer together, rather than drive us any further apart, when we really set about it in good earnest.

Our first need then is a philosophy—not just a philosophy of education, but a fundamental philosophy of religion, of culture, and of life in general. Having gained this, the rest is easy—largely a matter of method; and religious education will at once take its rightful place in the process, and, as a part of that, *Adult Religious Education*.

## II

Why is it so difficult to arouse enthusiasm for the study of the Bible, or Church History, or Missions, in the average congrega-

tion at the present day? There are exceptions, of course; when an inspired man takes hold, and interprets these subjects, and 'makes them live,' the small specialized 'Bible Class' group enlarges and makes a wider appeal throughout the parish. But it is not frequently done; and we hear with amazement of the great Bible Classes and other study groups of a generation or two ago. Perhaps, however, the exceptions throw light upon the problem and suggest its solution. What the inspired teacher does is 'interpret' these subjects, and show their relation to the religious and cultural aims of men and women today. Instead of dealing with bare facts, he is unveiling values, he is solving actual problems of living men and women in the present, he is contributing toward that synthesis of culture and religion, that fundamental philosophy of life, which we so greatly desiderate today.

I really cannot see why the study of early Hebrew History should make any widespread appeal to men and women today—or the study of early Egypt or early Greece. The literal Bible has disappeared; the Genesis-Geology controversy has subsided. Nor can we expect an enthusiastic revival of concentrated interest in Biblical Literature—the heyday of 'the Bible as literature,' from Matthew Arnold to Richard Moulton, is over, along with the popular Browning circles and Shakespeare clubs of the gay nineties and early nineteen-hundreds. But I can easily conceive an interested class gathering to discuss and study 'The Emergence of Religion in the Ancient World'—in Israel along with the other early peoples; or 'The History of Religious Ideas'; or 'the Passing and the Permanent in the Religion of Israel'; or 'Spiritual Values in the Bible'; or 'the Evolution of Religion in Hebraism, Judaism, and Christianity'—no doubt these titles are too heavy; anyone but a theological professor can think of lighter and more attractive ones. But what I am getting at is this: Bible-study, *per se*, makes little appeal; and 'the Bible as Literature' is too superficial; what we want is a study of vital problems of modern men and women and of the Bible as related to these problems, or vice versa. Take Otto's *Idea of the Holy*, which has gone round the world in fourteen or more editions.

It is a psychological and historical study of religion: but it is primarily an answer to everybody's question, what is this thing we call religion, this sense of awe and fascination in the presence of the Transcendent? And how is it related to rationality, to our reasoning minds, to art and philosophy and science? You learn more when you study with a motive, or even with a prejudice; mere accumulation of facts is not education—it is not even 'learning,' in the best sense.

We are of course touching here upon one of the fundamental problems of religion as a whole—of the whole Christian religion—in the midst of the new world in which we find ourselves. The contrast with the ancient world is clear, and between our age and the ancient one as the setting for religion. How did these old sacred books *become* sacred?—By the process of providing answers to the problems men faced in that world, such as: Where did the world itself come from? How did it come to be? What was God's relation to Israel, and Israel's relation to God? What was the authority of the sacred Law, and whence was it derived? What was Israel's duty? How was a man to thread his way through the complex world about him, with spiritual or invisible forces controlling otherwise familiar objects and situations, with taboos attached like 'live wires' to daily acts and observances? What was Israel's relation to other nations and their gods? How could you account for the evils in life—national or tribal catastrophes, plague, famine, destruction from on high? How could you explain the sense of inner wrong, and the presence of that inward diathesis toward disobedience men call sin? How can sin be done away, and its consequences counteracted? How came the holy places to be made sacred? What was the origin of the religious and civil institutions of the people—Sabbath, Passover, Circumcision, Temple, Priesthood? How, and when, and where, were the sacrifices, to be offered? What was the real nature and moral character of the mysterious being Israel worshipped as God? It is far and away too facile and superficial a reading of the Old Testament to see in it only the charming story of the external fortunes and misfortunes of a primitive people, or the naïve

literature of an unspoiled early race—that is no better than the older supernaturalist view which took everything at face value, and accepted the literal truth of every statement. On the contrary, almost every page of the Old Testament betrays an undercurrent of aetiology in ancient Hebrew thinking. It is a '*rational*' as well as a 'religious and holy' hope that inspired the ancient writers. No other Semitic religion ever rose to such a height of rationality, in dealing with the inherited customs and rites and conceptions come down from an earlier antiquity. By its side, even mediaeval Mohammedanism, magnificent as it is, stands outside comparison—for it contains a blend of other elements, non-Semitic and non-primitive. But to go back to the other contrast we were speaking of: These books became sacred, became a Bible, because they answered questions. They were, in a sense, 'the oracles of God.' And such they continued to be, down through Christian times, almost to the present. True, they were 'spiritually' interpreted, or 'allegorically' or 'mystically,' by Philo and Origen and Gregory the Great by Hengstenberg and Delitzsch and Archbishop Trench and Dr. MacLear. But they answered questions, for our grandfathers, as for the Puritans and the monastics, and for the Fathers, and for the ancient Jews, and the earlier Hebrews themselves. But who thinks of going to the Old Testament for answers to questions, now? The very books we read, the very phrases we use, prove that *we* do not; we speak of 'light *on* the Old Testament' from archæology, from parallels in folk-lore and primitive religion in other quarters, from Babylonian psalms and Egyptian proverbs and wisdom-ideas in the Graeco-Roman world, from Iranian and Zoroastrian eschatology, and from the rubbish-heaps of buried cities in the Fayûm. Instead of a beacon of light, the Old Testament has become an obscure literature, requiring illumination and explanation. and our problems remain! As Ludwig Lewisohn has put it: 'No God has spoken [in the Old Testament,] no revelation has been made.'

Now of course this is an extreme view. Men study the Old Testament and do receive light, and guidance, and the nurture

of the inner life. But not many. The problems of men today are different, and *the answers* they require are not to be found, to any large degree, in the pages of that great and ancient Holy Book. Some day it will surely seem strange that the Christian Church continued for centuries reading the Hebrew Law and Prophets, and reciting the Jewish Psalms, instead of creating an aetiological Bible of its own—perhaps drawn from all the religions of mankind, at least from others than the Hebrew, but not failing to create new parts of its own; and producing its own spiritual hymnology to take the place of (at least some part of) the Jewish Psalter.

Instead of studying Biblical History as Literature, then, Adult Religious Education ought to concern itself with the religious problems of men and women today; and if it uses the ancient biblical literature, it should do so by way of illustration and illumination, not as an end in itself—*i.e.*, not for the sake of mere knowledge, or culture, but for the ends of genuine modern religious living. It is remarkable how valuable the Old Testament is, from this point of view, and all the more extraordinary how easily we overlook it!

We can easily recognize what were some of the questions the Old Testament answered—about the origin of the world, God's government of the world, man's duties, the place of religious institutions in society and their origin—and so on. We can also see what some of the questions were that the New Testament answered, about the life of Christ, the beginnings of the Christian movement, the duties of Christians (whether as disciples of Christ, as in Q, Mark, and Luke; or as observers of the true Law, as in Matthew), who are the true leaders in the Church, what was the relation of Christians to Jews and to the state, and so on. But what are the questions *now* asked, by contemporary men and women, both within and without the Church? Here are some that I believe are important:

1. The origin of the world and of the human race—was it accidental, or purposeful?
2. Can we continue to believe in God as real—or only as an abstraction, an 'ideal,' a 'principle'?

3. What are the ultimate bases of ethics? And is *one* code or set of standards absolute and final?
4. Is immortality, *i.e.* personal immortality, possible? And if possible, is it probable?
5. Has religion any direct bearing on politics, economics, industrial and social organization, or are these controlled by purely physical, statistical, or biological principles?
6. What becomes of Christianity, and of traditional religion generally, in the light of modern psychological analysis of human character and behavior?
7. What becomes of the conception of righteousness, in view of the general relativity of ethics observable in past history?
8. Is any compelling motive left for missionary endeavor?
9. Is Christ's teaching infallible?—or is it only a particular extract from first century Jewish religious and moral teaching?
10. Is Christian doctrine anything more than a *mélange* of late classical popular philosophy, oriental mysticism, and hair-splitting theological disputations of the patristic, scholastic, and reformation periods?
11. Can you be a Christian without believing the Christian creed—or the doctrinal system of some one particular church?
12. Are the stories of Christ's life as told in the Gospels (including the Resurrection and the Virgin Birth) legends, myths, or sober history?

These are a few examples of the many questions now being asked of and by religious people—and to be real and effective, adult education must grapple with the real problems in men's minds. Otherwise it will be formal and uninteresting and will not appeal to voluntary students.

Of course, to answer these questions, or even to discuss them intelligently, involves a knowledge of the *facts*. Too much discussion of religion is sophomoric and uninformed. But the facts must be presented with the problems in mind—even scientific study and investigation follows that method! And I suggest that effective Adult Religious Education will follow the same method—the adoption of a project of research, of a problem for solution, a unified or related set of questions to be answered.



## REGARDING A REVIEW

By BURTON SCOTT EASTON, General Theological Seminary

"Why according to Matthew?" In Dr. Bacon's *Studies in Matthew* two alternative answers are given to this question. One is the suggestion that in the locality where the First Gospel originated there was a tradition that (a?) Matthew had been the first missionary to that region. This answer of Dr. Bacon's I duly recorded in my review of his book published in our January number. The second answer, however, I did not mention and by not doing so Dr. Bacon feels that I have done him an injustice.<sup>1</sup> I will therefore repair the omission.

As Dr. Bacon sees it, the development may be explained as follows. Our First Gospel was published somewhere in (north-ern?) Syria in the last decade of the first century. Whatever title it bore originally—probably simply "The Gospel" (page 19)—it in no way professed to be the work of Matthew and no tradition connected it with Matthew. In due course it found its way into southern Syria and Palestine, and became known to "the intensely Jewish-Christian, anti-Pauline sect of Ebionites" (page 43), who lived in Transjordan and near the Dead Sea. They also knew the Gospel of Luke. But as neither writing was sufficiently Jewish for their tastes, some one among them produced a composite work from both Gospels and other material, using however our First Gospel as the predominant source. This work the Ebionites adopted as authoritative.

Various fragments of this writing have been preserved to us, in one of which (Epiphanius, *Panarion* xxx. 13) we see that the compiler combined Mt. 9:9 and 10:3 so as to put at the end of the (now defective) list of the Twelve the words: "And thee, Matthew, sitting at the toll-booth, I called and thou didst follow me." In this way, as Dr. Bacon justly says, "Matthew is

<sup>1</sup> "A Review Reviewed" in our March number.

specially selected to play a distinctive part" (page 44), and, "The compiler of Ev. Hebr. is using Mt. 9:9 with the purpose of suggesting that the Apostle Matthew whom Jesus had called from the collection of taxes could and did serve the appointed body of the Twelve as the recorder of their 'testimony to Israel'" (page 45; Dr. Bacon prints this last passage in italics). But why was Matthew thus singled out? The answer Dr. Bacon thinks is "probably connected with his ability as a tax-collector to handle the pen" (page 44).

Thus a tradition was created that Matthew had really written a Gospel, although the Ebionites themselves called their work merely "The Gospel." But, when it was circulated outside Ebionite circles and was compared with other writings similarly titled, "The Gospel" necessarily received distinguishing additions. So in northern Egypt was added "according to the Hebrews," by other Christians "according to the Twelve Apostles," while still others reasoning from the compiler's adaptation of Mt. 9:9 might reasonably supply "according to Matthew": in Dr. Bacon's words this latter title "may well have been sometimes conferred upon the Ebionite composite which did purport to be written by Matthew in fulfilment of the intention of Jesus himself" (page 46). Orthodox circles, however, would resent the appropriation of an apostle's name by heretics, and consequently might claim the same apostle as the author of their own—thus far anonymous—First Gospel; the process—to use Dr. Bacon's illustration on page 42—can be compared to the "restoration" of a headless statue by placing on it a head made originally for quite a different body.

In any event, he argues, the First Gospel could have been called "according to Matthew" only *after* the Ebionite work had been so styled. If the orthodox writing had borne an apostle's name before Ev. Hebr. was known, orthodox Christians would never have applied the same name to so heretical a document; the latter's (reputed) authorship could be ascribed to the Apostle Matthew only by "readers not of the Ebionite circle, and not acquainted with any other Gospel claiming this name" (page 46).

This is the answer which Dr. Bacon prefers to the question "Why according to Matthew?"

Now when I wrote my review I did not overlook this answer. To do so would have been rather difficult, since it is set forth not only on pages 41-46 of the text but also in the lengthy Appended Note VI and in much of Appended Note X. I omitted it deliberately and for two main reasons. In the first place no justice can be done this very interesting theory by summary statement; to explain and discuss it adequately is a rather lengthy task and my review was already somewhat extended. In the second place I felt that my review was already unduly critical, and that if I entered into this particular problem I should be obliged to register so strong a note of dissent as to give an unjust picture of my attitude to Dr. Bacon's magnificent *Studies*. But since Dr. Bacon in his rejoinder has most kindly dispensed me from such scruples, I will accord to his request and speak without reserve.

With the best will in the world I can find in his proposal no cogency at all.

In the first place, I cannot believe that when our First Gospel reached the Ebionites it was an anonymous work. I have, indeed, difficulty in believing it ever was anonymous, since the circle for which it was intended already knew Mark, the work which from its opening words had created the title "Gospel" for a literary form. Perhaps our First Evangelist succeeded in robbing Mark of this title and in seizing it for himself; it is possible, but in view of the First Gospel's perpetual dependence on the Second it does not seem to me likely. But, be that as it may, the neighboring communities certainly did not discard Mark as soon as they knew Matthew; they kept both and so were obliged to distinguish them by title, while the advent of Luke, whether earlier or later than Matthew, would further increase the need for a special nomenclature for each of the Synoptists. And this took place before Ev. Hebr. was written, since this document uses Luke as well as Matthew—and possibly Mark as well. No doubt the Ebionites applied "The Gospel" to their own compilation alone, but everywhere else in western Syria, Palestine and

Asia Minor Matthew, Mark and Luke had special names. To revert to Dr. Bacon's figure, our First Gospel was not a headless statue at all at the time he presupposes.

He thinks, moreover, that the reason for Ev. Hebr.'s selection of Matthew as its scribe was the fact that this apostle is called a publican in Mt. 10:3: the compiler thought a tax-collector would have a special ability in handling a pen. Gentile Christians, in fact, did so think, for this ability of publicans has been noted constantly by all manner of writers on the First Gospel. But I am not clear that in Jewish circles—and we are dealing with Ebionites—the same would be true. All Jewish children learned to write as a matter of course, and Jews would recognize in publicans only superior arithmetical attainments. However, the writer of Ev. Hebr. may conceivably have reasoned as Dr. Bacon assumes.

Even so, the next steps seem to me extraordinarily difficult. Since Ev. Hebr. was written with an especial animus against orthodoxy, it never could have had much circulation outside of Ebionite circles. Only occasional orthodox Christians would have taken time to study it, and only a few of these would have puzzled out the assumed Matthean authorship; it is for this reason, I suppose, that Dr. Bacon words his statement so cautiously: the title "according to Matthew" "may well have been sometimes conferred upon it." But his theory demands that we should attribute to these occasional and somewhat hypothetical Christians the power to determine future Gospel terminology. It was they who decided that the title which the First Gospel already bore should be dropped and that it should henceforth be known as "according to Matthew." They decided this because they disliked the competition of Ev. Hebr. And they induced all other Christians to follow their decision—so thoroughly that no other title is ever again given Matthew.

I cannot believe it.

Nor do I see how this theory is reconcilable with Dr. Bacon's reconstruction on page 58, where he speaks of the First Gospel's spread "westward toward Antioch, where Ignatius accepts it,

most likely along with a claim that it was (perhaps in some broad sense) 'according to Matthew.' But if *Ev. Hebr.* was responsible for this designation we are obliged to assume a much more complicated process. The First Gospel could not have moved directly westward to Antioch. It must first have spread southwest into Transjordan, where it joined Luke's work. There it served as a source for *Ev. Hebr.*, and afterward in some neighboring locality received the *Matthaeian* title. Not until then could it spread northwest to Antioch and reach Ignatius as in any sense "according to Matthew."

Such a process moreover would require considerable time. No doubt some twenty years can be allowed between the writing of the Gospel and Ignatius' departure for Asia Minor and Rome, and much could happen in those twenty years. But I cannot believe that among those events was so roundabout a movement of the Gospel, avoiding Antioch until it acquired its name. It would surely spread from its first place of writing to the capital of Syria at least as soon as it would enter Transjordan. And in Antioch it would receive a distinguishing name, even if it had none already. From Antioch its progress into Asia Minor would be rapid—name and all—and it must have been familiar to the Christian East long before the compiler of *Ev. Hebr.* finished his task. By that time the tradition would have been too firmly fixed to be upset by conjectures drawn from the Ebionite work.

As to Dr. Bacon's remaining contention, that *Ev. Hebr.* could never have been called "according to Matthew" if our First Gospel was already so styled. There is a distinction between official and unofficial nomenclature, and also a distinction between the canonical and pre-canonical periods. When a community had formally accepted the First Gospel as the inspired work of an apostle, we may be very sure that it would never designate *Ev. Hebr.* as *Matthaeian*. At the beginning of the second century, however, matters were not yet so hard and fast. Individual orthodox Christians here and there—and Dr. Bacon argues for nothing more than a scattered few—might be in real doubt as to which work was really authentic. This would be enough to create

a vague tradition in orthodox circles that the Ebionites used a work by Matthew, particularly as few of these Christians would know or care anything about it. This is what we find in Irenaeus. He has never seen *Ev. Hebr.* and is perfectly ignorant of its contents; all he knows is that the Ebionites used a gospel claiming to be Matthew's, which he identifies with the canonical work. Something of the same sort occurred with the Nazorean gospel, which was similarly confused with our Matthew by orthodox writers.



## NOTES AND COMMENTS

By BURTON SCOTT EASTON, General Theological Seminary

Again it is our task to record a lamentably long necrology list: George Alexander, who was born in 1843, spanned in his lifetime nearly three generations of American Presbyterianism, which he represented in its most liberal and progressive aspects.

Philipp Bachmann, born in 1864, held simultaneously at the University of Erlangen the two chairs of Systematic Theology and of New Testament. He represented to perfection the Erlangen tradition of an enlightened and learned conservatism, and took his place very consciously and conscientiously in the following of von Hofmann and von Zahn. New Testament students know him chiefly through his two volumes on Corinthians in the Zahn series (1905 and 1909; several editions of each). In systematic theology his works were usually rather specialized, but his *Grundlinien der systematischen Theologie* (1907) presents his system as a whole. His most popular book, however, was in Church history, an *Abriss* (1912) that has gone through about a dozen editions.

William Francis Barry, born in 1849, was trained as a theologian and taught philosophy and theology for many years. He produced no important work in his own field, however, preferring to work as a very prolific essayist and biographer, with a few incursions into the realm of novel writing.

William Eleazar Barton, born in 1861, achieved a multitudinous activity. All his lifetime he was an active Congregational pastor and he held very responsible charges. He found time, however, to teach in the Chicago (Congregational) Seminary for many years and to act as editor for such diverse journals as *Bibliotheca Sacra* and *The Youth's Companion*. In theology he wrote many books of a popular nature, but his study of the present-day Samaritans in three monographs (1906-7)

has permanent value. Otherwise his chief interest was in American pioneer history, which in the latter part of his life centered in Abraham Lincoln; his biography of the latter is a classic.

Clarence Augustine Beckwith, born in 1849, spent the first part of his life in the Congregational pastorate but after 1892 turned to the academic world with systematic theology as his specialty; from 1905 until 1924 he and Dr. Barton were colleagues at the Chicago Seminary. His *Realities in Christian Theology* (1906) and *The Idea of God* (1922) were his chief works.

Thomas Herbert Bindley, born in 1861, specialized in Patristics and was in particular an authority on Tertullian. He issued many authoritative editions—both in the original and in translation—of important Patristic writings, beginning with Tertullian's *Apologeticus* in 1889. Otherwise he was interested in symbolics, as in *The Creeds* (1896), *Oecumenical Documents of the Faith* (3d edition, 1925), and *Witnesses to the Creeds* (1915).

Henry King Carroll, born in 1849, was universally known in the United States as an expert ecclesiastical statistician, whose figures everyone trusted. In addition to this he was active as an historian of American Methodism.

Robert Henry Charles was born in Ireland in 1855. After his education in Trinity College, Dublin, where he took first class honors in classics, he was ordained in 1883 and for a while served in the active ministry in London. His gift for languages led him into the special study of Syriac and Ethiopic, and his mastery of the latter language enabled him in 1893 to publish the first really critical edition of the Book of Enoch. The success of this effort fixed his career and for the next twenty years one volume of apocalypics followed another until virtually all the pseudepigrapha were issued in a "Charles" edition. And at the end of the two decades in 1913 came his monumental *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, in which all his results were gathered together. It is not too much to say that these twenty years' labors of Dr. Charles made apocalyptic study into a true independent discipline, and that he, more than any other

one person, revolutionized New Testament study by providing for the first time a real insight into the religious background. As the importance of his researches were realized, he was called back into academic life, but, as things were then, there was no chair in any British University that corresponded with his specialty; it was therefore necessary to make him Professor of Biblical Greek, first (1898) in Dublin and then (1905) at Oxford. In 1913 he was made Canon of Westminster and in 1919 Archdeacon; the latter dignity he held until his death. In 1920 came his massive two volume commentary on Revelation, and he announced that he was now at the end of his apocalyptic studies. But the attraction of the field proved too strong for him to keep to this resolution, with his commentary on Daniel (1927) as a result. All through his life, however, he never lost sight of the responsibilities of his ministry, and his scientific publications were interlarded with a steady output of sermons and ethical works, while at Westminster he took his archdiaconal functions with the utmost seriousness and regarded himself as having responsible oversight over the poor of the neighborhood. A genial acquaintance—Irish to his finger tips—he found his recreation in golf and in woodcarving. As a scholar his work marks a genuine epoch, and his faults, such as they were, were those of the opener of an epoch who so towers above his contemporaries as to be thrown entirely on his own resources. As a result he was prone to follow his own intensely logical thought processes to their furthest conclusions; a characteristic that found its expression in so free a textual rearrangement of the sources on which he worked that most other specialists have found themselves unable to follow him.

Ozora Stearns Davis, born in 1866, made up with Dr. Beckwith and Dr. Barton a third in the remarkable faculty of the Chicago Seminary; he was its president from 1909 until not long before his death. His numerous publications were homiletic and pastoral.

Leopold Fonck, born in 1865, entered the Society of Jesus in 1892. In 1901 he was appointed Professor of Biblical Science

at Innsbruck; in 1908 he was transferred to the Gregorian University in Rome in charge of the New Testament and the next year was given the same chair in the Pontifical Institute of Biblical Studies and was made Rector. He was consequently largely responsible for the official Roman Catholic attitude in matters Biblical during a very crucial period. His writings were chiefly popular and controversial.

Walker Gwynne was born in 1845 and ordained in 1871. A prolific writer of popular and devotional works, he turned the attention of his later years to an uncompromising battle against divorce.

Cyril Hefner, born in 1872, and at the time of his death Canon of Winchester, was a very well known writer on devotional and mystical subjects. His *Fellowship of Silence* (1917) is probably his best known book.

Theodor Nöldeke, born in 1836, had reached so great an age that the latter part of his life was necessarily spent in retirement; his last important book was issued in 1912. In his day he was one of the best known Orientalists of Germany, specializing in Arabic and Syriac. At the age of twenty-four he published his *Geschichte des Korans*, which was crowned by the Paris Academy, and which established his reputation as one of the foremost European experts in Mohammedanism. His *Mandaean Grammar* (1875) laid the foundations of a real knowledge of that language, while his *Syriac Grammar* (1880) is still in use. With the Old Testament field he did not particularly concern himself, but he wrote a survey of Old Testament literature in 1868.

Richard Reitzenstein, born in 1861, was a classicist who brought an extraordinarily rich and exact knowledge of the byways of the Hellenistic and Oriental worlds to illuminate the history of early Christianity. In his *Poimandres* (1904) he called attention in an entirely fresh fashion to the contacts between Christianity and the Hermetic literature; this volume started a very fruitful controversy on the meaning of Logos. His *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (1910; 3d edition 1927) has played a notable part in the "mystery-religion" debate,

but after the war he turned his interests to Mandaeanism as a source for the knowledge of New Testament events. His *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* unquestionably went too far and tended rather to discredit his efforts: he thought he could reconstruct much of John the Baptist's preaching and to show the deep influence of the latter on Christ. But his *Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* (1929) was better balanced and has in some measure rehabilitated his thesis.

Robert William Rogers, born in 1864, was Professor of Old Testament in Drew Theological Seminary. He was appointed to this chair at the age of twenty-nine, after education at the University of Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins and Leipsic. His first significant work was his *History of Babylonia*, which first appeared in 1900 and has passed through many editions. Almost equally well known were his *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1909), *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (1912), *The Recovery of the Ancient Orient* (1912) and *History and Literature of the Hebrew People* (1917).

Heinrich Zimmern, born in 1862, was also an Assyriologist of note and his career paralleled that of Dr. Rogers rather closely; they seem even to have been students at Leipsic together. His *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, however—on which he worked with Dr. Winckler—was published nine years before Dr. Rogers' book on the same subject. Dr. Zimmern was best known for his mastery of the comparative philology of the Semitic languages; his well known grammar being issued in 1898.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The American Missal: being the Liturgy from the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church in the United States of America; with Introits, Graduals, and other devotions proper to the same; together with Propers for additional Holy Days and Saints' Days, and for Requiem and votive Masses.* Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1931. Buckram, \$30.00. Morocco, \$45.00. With Epistle and Gospel books, \$85.00 the set.

This undertaking seems destined to become for the time a storm-centre within the Episcopal Church. Yet upon examination there appears to be nothing particularly new or daring or defiant about it. New indeed it is, in that it is the first attempt, at least on any such scale, to construct an altar book in which the traditional ceremonies and devotions of the Roman Mass are applied to our American rite. Yet in many of our parishes and by many of our clergy such an application has long been made in practice, sometimes with less fidelity to the American Liturgy than is exhibited in the *American Missal*, which aims only to restrain and standardize existing usage. The editors have proceeded upon the principle of supplementation, never upon that of substitution. And they are careful to claim no more for their book than may legitimately be claimed for a private enterprise undertaken in an avowed spirit of loyalty to the Book of Common Prayer. "It is submitted for voluntary consideration and use in whole or in part, where, and only where, it may seem to possess any degree of value." It is difficult to see how, in principle, exception can properly be taken to the *Missal* on grounds that would not equally condemn a number of clergy and parishes in good standing in the Church. It seems to be as legitimate as the ceremonial practices of Anglo-Catholicism, which the Church tacitly allowed when she repealed the canon on ritual in 1904. Is it any more disloyal to put the *Missal* on the altar than it is to use Roman fashions without it?

The question remains, however, how far Episcopalians may in honesty and loyalty go in approximating the ceremonies of



the Holy Communion to those of the Latin Mass. Quite apart from the matter of doctrine—and this is by no means an unimportant consideration—it is well to remember that our American eucharistic rite is not purely Western in type, but has a Greek strain in its ancestry. In consequence, any attempt to regulate its ceremonial by the *Missale Romanum* can be at best only forced and unnatural. Ceremonies ought to *grow* naturally out of a rite; they are *forced* into it only at the sacrifice of reality and consistency. It is to be hoped that some day our Liturgy will have an authoritative ceremonial that will be rich and colorful, but entirely free from the Roman obsession.

The Kalendar of the new *Missal* is quite comprehensive. We are told that it is based on those adopted by the principal religious orders in the Anglican communion. But it includes the feasts of *Corpus Christi*, the Sacred Heart, and *Christus Rex*, and these are provided with Propers in an appendix. The two latter can by no ingenuity be claimed as having any place in Anglican tradition, even in its most extended form; but *Christus Rex* may perhaps be justified on other grounds.

The Propers are provided with Introits, Graduals, Offertory and Communion anthems, Secretas, and Post-communions from the Roman rite. It is unfortunate that the translations are frequently jagged and lacking in facility. The traditional ceremonies of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Holy Week, etc., are incorporated, with occasional approximations to the Prayer Book—as in the Blessing of the Font and the accompanying litany on Easter Even. It is to be presumed that in some parishes the new *Missal* will be used for the sake of the additional Propers. For those who wish so to use it, without the medieval ceremonial of the Latin rite, the Order for Holy Communion from the Prayer Book is reprinted exactly.

It appears a second time as the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, with rubrics and supplementary devotions from the Roman rite. The collect, "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts . . .," being a part of the preparation, is properly ordered to be said at the lowest altar step. The Confession, Absolution, and Com-

fortable Words are bracketed for omission if there are to be no communions. Whether this is in harmony with post-reformation Anglican tradition, let the reader judge. Certainly there is imposing Anglo-Catholic authority against it.

At certain places in the canon, conformity to the Prayer Book seems rather forced and disingenuous. Thus, at the Words of Institution the priest is directed to "break the Host slightly." At the Prayer of Humble Access he is to kneel down and "straightway" rise again and say it standing. The *Gloria in Excelsis* is graciously left in its Anglican position; thus what is perhaps the most aggravated point of nonconformity among extreme Anglo-Catholics is discouraged. But the Ablutions are put at the Roman place. This may possibly be "both liturgically and devotionally the most fitting time"—but this reviewer ventures to think that he is not alone in feeling that the argument by which the editors justify their departure from the rubric is hardly candid.

There are several ways in which this new Missal may be used. To some it will appeal as offering enrichment and variety where a daily Eucharist is celebrated. There can be no great harm in having a Proper for every day in Lent. Probably there are not many clergy today who hold (at any rate in practice) that any and every addition to the Prayer Book is prohibited. Some, eager to feel at one with the main stream of western Catholicism, will like it because it brings our rite into contact with the Roman. But this has for some time been the case in fact. Anyway, the *American Missal* is much less Roman than the present use in certain of our parishes. So far it is a restraining and stabilizing influence. Elsewhere, if adopted, it might be a constant temptation to romanization in ceremonial. This is the worst that is likely to happen, and to many of us the prospect is sufficiently appalling. Where it replaces the Prayer Book upon our altars the majority of churchmen are bound to regret it. Where it replaces other and more objectionable unauthorized books, and controls ritualistic extremes by reference to the American rite, we welcome and commend it.

In form it is a credit to its publishers. The volume is substantial without being cumbersome; the typography dignified without being ornate. The musical parts, particularly, are worthy of the highest praise.

P. V. NORWOOD.

*Die Beiden Makkabäerbücher.* By Hugo Bévenot. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1931, pp. 260. M. 9.60.

The Introduction to this commentary on I-II Maccabees contains a very useful collection of current critical opinions from a considerable number of relevant studies. Within this body of judgments will be found parallels to the majority of the author's conclusions.

Accepting the obvious inference that the author of I Macc. is a Palestinian Jew, Dom Bévenot describes him further not as a Sadducee (against Geiger and Kautzsch) but as a "true Jew," attached to the Law, sympathetic with the Maccabean dynasty, and above all a good story-teller.

In respect to the problems of date and integrity he is, in general, on the side of Torrey, Ettelson (in his notable work in the Transactions of the Connecticut Academy for 1925), of Niese and Recht, against Destinon, Wellhausen and Roth. He subscribes to the integrity of I Macc. in Hebrew and Greek. He believes that it must have been written not long after the death of John Hyrcanus, at the latest, but because he thinks that the chronicles of John (16: 23, 24) could have been written before his death, he suggests 120 B.C. as the *terminus a quo*.

Agreeing with Eduard Meyer, against Willrich, who makes the author of II Macc. a contemporary of Philo, Dom Bévenot believes that the authority of an eye-witness must be postulated. He therefore dates the second book at least as early as the first, and thinks that it is quite possibly earlier. He describes the unknown author of II Macc. as an Alexandrian Jew, possibly a rabbi, whose aim was to epitomize the five books of Jason of Cyrene for the edification of the rising generation. He correctly points out that the evidence does not demand a third writer, a

redactor of the abridgement. The *Epitomator* wrote independently of I Macc., but both books, the one Greek, the other Hebrew, rest ultimately, if not with equal directness, upon identical Hebrew-Aramaic sources.

Dom Bévenot's treatment of the epistolary "sources" of I-II Macc. is scarcely less definitive than that of Elias Bickermann, who affirms the impeccability of the epistles. Comparison with the papyri has indeed shown the respectability of the incorporated correspondence, but, as J. W. Hunkin has said, it does not follow that the letters existed in a documentary form.

The final sections of the Introduction forecast the excellence of the succeeding commentary. The author's special contribution to the study of the canonical books of the Maccabees is to be found principally in his knowledge of the theatre of events and of the history of the Seleucid dynasty and contemporary Hellenistic culture. The commentary proper, which contains, in addition to textual notes, comments upon political and religious subjects, abundantly illustrates the text from Greek writers and recent collections of inscriptions.

To Bévenot's excellent bibliography there ought to be added W. Otto's indispensable *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte*, 1928.

MACKINLEY HELM.

*The Historic Jesus.* By James Mackinnon. Longmans, Green, and Company, 1931, pp. xxxii + 407.

Dr. Mackinnon, who is Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Edinburgh, is best known by his numerous writings in the field of modern history, chiefly English and Scottish. His *Luther and the Reformation* in four volumes has been appearing since 1925. All these works are solid and substantial historical studies, though not without certain prejudices and presuppositions of a modern Protestant nature.

He has now turned to the life and teaching of our Lord, and has produced one more of the "large" lives of Christ—in dimension comparable to the old-fashioned kind which Schweitzer predicted would never again appear. The author not only takes

for granted the modern source-criticism of the Synoptics, but is also pretty well versed in *Formgeschichte*. It is a question, however, if he has sufficiently steeped his mind in the *Formgeschichtliche* method to realize quite how far it carries one.

For example, the old Marcan framework is still left standing, with the Baptism and the Temptation at the beginning of the ministry; and the Messianic consciousness, concealed at the start, but none the less fully developed in Jesus' own mind from the outset.

However, as a 'moderate' view, or summing-up of contemporary views, the work is excellent and well-written. Especially valuable are the clear, straightforward, and thoroughly critical examinations from time to time of the Johannine data. The Virgin Birth and the Resurrection are likewise handled in very clear fashion; and the materials are presented for a reasoned judgment on the part of the reader.

Critical as it is, there is no other contemporary work in English that will set before the ordinary reader the problems of our Lord's life and ministry so vividly as this one. The general viewpoint of the work is well seen in the following passage from the chapter on Jesus' "Education and Development" (pp. 46f.):

"He who grew up in the freer atmosphere of Galilee which, we might almost say, predestined it to be the nursery of Christianity, and assiduously learned in the school of nature and life, would have little taste for the formal and complicated lore of the scribes. His robust sense of things, his artless mind, would perforce tend to revolt against the artificial religiosity of the pundits of the law. Their scholasticism would only excite dislike and drive him to the living fountain of the prophets and the Psalms. The 'wisdom' which later astounded his fellow-townsmen, he drew from this living fountain and from his own musings in contact with nature and life. It bears the stamp of Hebrew, not of Greek thought, for by the wisdom and culture of the Greeks he is quite untouched. With it he absorbs the angelology and the demonology, the current beliefs which play such a striking part in the records of his mission. He is, indeed, in this respect a son of his time, and only as a son of his time could he have brought his message home to the hearts and minds of his hearers. He had learned to live with his time, and only so could he have read men and gauged a given situation with that wonderful resource and readiness of apprehension which strike the modern student of his life at every step of it.

He has, too, the vivid imagination which this wonderful power implies, so vivid that he sees Satan fallen from heaven, visualizes the demons which he

exorcises, and in the temptation story sees the angels ministering unto him, at least in spirit. He has a quiet and simple relish of life, eating and drinking even with publicans and sinners without meticulous ceremonial scrupulosity or parade of fasting. What God gives he thankfully enjoys; what He withholds he gladly does without. He is a born altruist and optimist. He must take every opportunity to serve others, whilst gaining his daily bread in the sweat of his brow. He has all the optimist's impulse to change and better his Galilean world, and is prepared to challenge opposition in behalf of his lofty moral and spiritual ideal when the time comes. He will venture on the hazardous enterprise of realising this ideal with a daring, a soaring faith that lifts him far above the common religious level. His message will be a sublime, uplifting, and enthusing one, the Gospel, the glad tidings of God's kingdom, God's presence among men as he has learned to know Him in his own soul, in the best of the old Hebrew literature, and in the marvel and beauty of God's world around him. It is not so much a doctrine as an experience of God that he is gradually acquiring and preparing to proclaim."

There is an occasional light touch that reminds one of Renan. But there are many pages where the going is heavy enough to remind one that it is the work of a scholar who has read and pondered most of the available material.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*The Problem of Right Conduct. A Text Book of Christian Ethics.* By Peter Green. Longmans, Green and Co., 1931, pp. xix + 296. \$2.50.

There are a few excellent books on the ethics of Jesus, and many which deal adequately with the social implications of Christianity. But in the English language there is no text book of ethics which a layman would read without being bored to tears.

This want Canon Peter Green seeks to meet in "The Problem of Right Conduct." He has written an outline of Christian ethics so clearly, and with such humor and such charm, that it is actually a delight to read it.

Canon Green's criticism and evaluation of theoretic, hedonistic, intuitionist and evolutionary ethical systems is excellent. But he has himself thought out a far from satisfactory one to take their place. "A basis for Ethics," he tells us, "cannot reasonably be sought otherwise than in the true nature of man. Right conduct for man must be that which is right or suitable for such a being as man really and truly is. Not suitable merely to me, or



to you, or to any third person, but to such a being as man. And not to man as he is but to man as he ought to be." But how do we know what man ought to be? To this Green answers, We do not yet know what he ought to be altogether. Our ideal is not static, but progressive, and will be ever before us. But we do know from psychology his various powers and characteristics; we do know as Christians that he "is a spiritual being, created in the image of God, and destined to immortality"; and we do know what his relationships to God, to other men and to society are—and to some extent what they ought to be. We know what man is at his best—we can forecast what he may become.

Now there can be no doubt that the Christian view or doctrine of man should play an important part in Christian Ethics. But it should not be the basis of Ethics. The greatest good which draws us with such compelling power is not ourselves as we ought to be, any more than it is our happiness. It is the Kingdom of God and his righteousness. That which makes us good and persuades us to do our best is the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ. Just as happiness comes to those who do not consciously seek it, so manhood.

There is another defect in this book. There is no discussion whatever of the Biblical basis of Christian Ethics. There is not even a reference to the problems which arise from the eschatological nature of so much of the teaching of Jesus. There is no discussion of the attitude of either Jesus or Paul to the law.

Yet Canon Green does deal well with the implications of the teaching of Jesus concerning God and the Kingdom and points out how profound the influence upon our lives and our attitude toward life those beliefs and convictions should have, which are the outcome of the religious significance for us of Christ himself. Unlike many modern writers on Christian Ethics he sees clearly how deeply our beliefs concerning the resurrection, the atonement and eternal life may influence and color our lives.

In his closing section in which he discusses the problems of individual and social ethics Canon Green is at his best. While he cannot completely escape the snare of legalism in dealing with

marriage and sex, he has no such handicap in discussing the Christian's attitude toward property. Here it is admirable.

In spite, therefore, of the defects of this book, it is so clearly and charmingly written, and in the light of Christianity discusses so well the moral problems that are uppermost in our minds today, that it is well worth reading. Indeed, as a brief introduction to Christian Ethics no better book is available.

WILLIAM L. WOOD.

*Paradoxy, The Destiny of Modern Thought.* By Richard Rothschild. Richard R. Smith, 1931, pp. xvii + 256. \$3.00.

As the title might lead one to infer, the theme of this book is that the antinomies of the universe are beyond the wit of man to resolve. We should be content to push the reason as far as it may legitimately go and then rest in a pious acceptance of the paradoxes that remain. We are, therefore, not surprised that the author finds a place for some aspects of idealism, realism, pragmatism, and all the rest.

This is not to say that the author is merely crying, 'Good God, good Devil.' On the contrary he presents a very well-defined point of view. He insists as against the realists that all philosophy must start with the human intelligence, as the only datum of which we have immediate knowledge. In the train of Hume, Kant, and Karl Pearson, he insists that the only physical world that we can know anything about is a construct of human experience. Each separate experience is to be checked, however, by the whole experience of the individual, and that by the experiences of others. He points out the value of language in crystallizing what would otherwise be a mere phantasmagoria into definite concepts. These concepts form our *real* world. He acknowledges a God, but not personal immortality.

Religion he finds to be wholly symbolic, yet not *merely* symbolic.

"The symbolism of religion is no mere incidental element. It does not represent a plastering on of 'poetry' in order to appeal to the so-called average man—something which the individual can do away with, provided only he is intelligent enough. For just as we found the words of a language to be no mere tags arbitrarily assigned to ideas, but rather the very embodiments that

make those ideas possible to all, so symbols in religion, whether in the form of trappings of worship, or events like the crucifixion of Jesus, or arbitrary laws like the Ten Commandments, or a theological creed, or even an exemplary life, are actually the embodiments which seize the meaning out of the nothingness of abstraction and bring it into the only sort of reality one can ever know."

If one may criticize adversely a book of very great excellence, it would be that the writer's ontology is not clearly defined. He opposes the view that "process" is the ultimate reality—as, for instance, that the self is completely defined as the stream of consciousness—and yet he repudiates the idea of "substance" (in the scholastic sense) or underlying ground of phenomena. Yet one or the other of these propositions *must* be true, and there seems to be no room here for "paradox."

In his epistemology, while the author rightly insists that knowledge is built up both by analysis and synthesis, and emphasizes the importance of the latter, it seems that he regards as synthetic mental pictures that are clearly primary perceptions. Thus, he says that we build up the picture of a chair by combining, in what he calls a "wilful synthesis," our impressions of legs, seat, back and arms. We do no such thing. What we perceive primarily, and unless our attention is purposely focused upon one of the members, is the chair as a whole. The psychologists of the *Gestalt* school have demonstrated that any experience is a whole. This psychology, by the way, might have furnished the author with powerful weapons for his insistence upon the fallacy of mere analysis as a pathway to reality; and it is strange that he did not avail himself of it.

The book is a pleasure to read, not only on account of its fecundity of ideas and lucidity of expression but also for the attractive form in which the publisher has clothed it.

CHARLES L. DIBBLE.

*Adventures in Philosophy and Religion.* By James Bissett Pratt. Macmillan, 1931, pp. xi + 263. \$2.00.

In these delightful dialogues on philosophy, Socrates is confronted by a collection of modern naturalistic thinkers,—idealist, neo-realist, new-realist, pragmatist, behaviorist, instrumentalist,

and Mr. Bertrand Russell,—all of whom agree in repudiating dualism, in particular the dualism of mind and body. They disagree in almost everything else. Socrates cleverly leads them all to a point where they say, "But that would lead us straight to dualism!" as if that settled everything. Professor Pratt's theme is, "But what's the matter with dualism, anyway?"

Then there is a long dialogue on some of the newer theological movements, represented by the Reverend Advanced Humanist, the Reverend Only Truechurch, Mr. Social Worker, a professor of science of religion, and others. The humanist in this dialogue is talked into recognizing a discord between his naturalistic monism and his reverence for man. Truechurch is supposed to be an Anglo-Catholic; more truly he is several kinds of Anglo-Catholic, and talks sometimes the language of a mere ecclesiastic, sometimes that of Bp. Gore, sometimes that of the Critical Catholics. The fact that he shows such a ridiculous inconsistency (the great question is truth and salvation with or without the Church) is a fair enough representation of certain incoherences in Anglo-Catholicism, though it is not a fair representation of any one type of it. Perhaps that is the defect all through the book: one character represents a somewhat variegated school of thought, and divergences within the school are represented as self-contradictions of the individual who maintains it.

The collection includes also a dialogue on immortality, in which the arguments are almost all negative, but in the finale all are surprised to find themselves in the Elysian Fields. Lastly, there are two pieces looking toward rapprochement of Christianity and Buddhism.

"In the spirit of good-humored fun," but with "earnest conviction," Professor Pratt stands for "the reality of the psychical and the self," and is willing to accept battle on the issue of dualism. He makes out the various cases against it with references (not exact quotations) to representative books; and although the battle is on the stage, and the stage-manager controls it, it is not a farce but a good play.

M. B. STEWART.

*Petrus Canisius: Kampf eines Jesuiten um die Reform der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands.* By Walter Schäfer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1931, pp. 174. M. 9.60.

The canonization, in 1925, of the great German Jesuit naturally aroused the interest even of Protestant historians; for perhaps the work of no other individual has been so calamitous to German Protestantism. From the side of the Jesuits there has been an extensive Canisius-literature, first in importance, of course, the eight volumes of *Epistulae et Acta*, edited by Braunsberger (completed in 1923). Protestant scholarship has been hitherto limited to such short studies as those of Paul Drews and Gustav Krüger. The present work, undertaken at the instance of the late Carl Mirbt, rests upon a painstaking examination of Braunsberger's volumes, without which it would have been, as the documentation shows, by no means possible.

Canisius was born in 1521, just as Luther was entering upon his year of forced but fruitful residence at the Wartburg following his appearance before the Diet of Worms. He died in 1597, as Ferdinand of Styria was beginning that course of repression which led straight on to the Thirty Years' War. Between those two dates German Protestantism reached its peak and began its decline. To that decline the first Jesuit of German race contributed not a little. Schäfer has undertaken to trace Canisius' relation to his Order and his efforts toward Catholic reform in Germany, as these are revealed in his own writings and correspondence. He shows that, while Canisius was outwardly a thorough and obedient Jesuit, he was in his intimate relations with the Society a stubborn and independent critic of the Jesuit program where it failed to realize his high expectations of reform. For it was in ecclesiastical reform that Canisius was particularly interested, and it was in hope of this that he joined the Society. The latter, however, showed itself more devoted to its own advantage than to the regeneration of the Church. Hence a certain bitterness of disillusionment, tension between the ardent reformer and his superiors in the Society as they sought to stifle his strictures on their measures. "Out of this opposition be-

tween Canisius' aspirations for his Order and the actual accomplishments of the Order with regard to the German province, his career is to be regarded as a religious tragedy." "Before the bar of history the Order has found in Canisius its most honest and most competent critic."

P. V. NORWOOD,

*The Origin and Growth of Religion.* By W. Schmidt. New York: Lincoln MacVeagh, 1931, pp. xvi + 302. \$5.00.

This latest work of Father Schmidt, the well-known editor of *Anthropos*, the author of several important works on Comparative Religion, and Professor in the University of Vienna, is rather a history of recent theories as to the origin and growth of religion than an account of the origin and growth of religion in themselves. To those acquainted with Father Smith's earlier work it will come with no surprise to find an anti-evolutionist attitude maintained throughout the present volume. The author is a stalwart champion of the doctrine of a primitive monotheism. Thus the series of theories as to the origin of religion here described, beginning with that of the nature-myth school, inevitably culminates in the conclusions of the author himself, stated with no lack of confidence.

To the establishment of his thesis the author, of course, brings a broad and highly documented knowledge of the fields of anthropology, ethnology and comparative religion. He is particularly ready with illustrations from the religious beliefs and customs of peoples of low-grade culture such as the Pygmies of Africa and the Ainus of Japan. Yet it is necessary to say that a good deal of his material will hardly bear the weight of the edifice the author seeks to build upon it. Certainly in the case of the Ainus this is the case. Archdeacon Batchelor, it is true, has credited the Ainus with something like primitive monotheism, or at least with belief in a sky-god, Kamui, but this "quaint interpretation of Ainuism" (as Dr. E. V. Hopkins terms it) has, in this particular, not won any general acceptance.

Father Schmidt would probably dismiss the opinion as based on



psychology rather than on history, but to the present writer the theory of an original monotheism later superseded by such things as animism and totemism suggests a very dismal story and is at any rate much less Christian in its implications than the despised evolutionary hypothesis which reveals a "sense of the numinous" or a *logos spermatikos* gradually, under divine guidance, rising to apprehension of one God fully revealed in Jesus Christ.

This must not be taken as depreciating the value of a volume in which an esteemed scholar has given us a history of the science of Comparative Religion succinctly and lucidly and as fairly as his very strong convictions made possible.

The translation is adequately done by Mr. H. J. Rose, whose preface and footnotes are sufficient to show that he by no means shares the conclusions of his author.

HERBERT H. GOWEN.

*Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story.* Edited by C. F. Andrews. New York: Macmillan, 1930, pp. 372. \$2.50.

This book is an abridgment made from three volumes of Mr. Gandhi's autobiography (the two large volumes called *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, and the volume called *Satyagraha (Soul-force) in South Africa*). Mr. Andrews has been very skilful in choosing the material for this abridgment. There has been no attempt to suppress material which might prejudice the reader against Mr. Gandhi. In fact the story of his youth pictures him in a most unflattering light and many Western readers will find it difficult to understand his influence. The book is meant to be studied with another book by Mr. Andrews, *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*.

One of the deepest impressions the book must leave with a Christian reader is the feeling of the terrible tragedy of a life lived with no understanding or conception of the Incarnation or the sacramental principle which is an extension of the Incarnation. This tragedy is most apparent in the distressing account of his married life. Marriage as a sacrament is outside his thought entirely, and there exist for him, apparently, no alternatives save

lustful cruelty and *Brachmacharya*, strict continence. But the same tragedy is seen in all phases of his life. Negation, rather than consecration, is his ideal. "To attain to perfect purity a man has to rise above the opposing currents of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion, and to become entirely passion-free in thought, speech and action." It is an ideal which has led Mr. Gandhi to an heroic self-sacrifice, which puts most of us to shame. But the ideal is not that set forth by Him who came that we "might have life and might have it more abundantly."

W. F. WHITMAN.

*The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.* By James Muilenburg. Marburg, Germany, 1929, pp. viii + 170. (Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 1926.)

This interesting and scholarly brochure was presented by its author to the Faculty of the Divinity School of Yale University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. As its title indicates, it is an investigation of the literary relationships of two of the most interesting and perplexing works of the literature known as "the Apostolic Fathers." As every reader of this literature knows, both the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* and the *Epistle to Barnabas* contain sections which deal with the "two ways," the way of life and the way of death. Ever since the publication of the *Teaching* in 1883 by Bishop Bryennios it has been recognized that either one of these writings drew from the other, or that both drew from a common Jewish source which embodied the teaching on the "two ways." Each of the three possibilities has had its advocates. Some have held that *Barnabas* drew from the teaching of the *Didache*, others that the *Didache* borrowed from *Barnabas*. An important group has maintained that both were dependent upon a Jewish source.

Dr. Muilenburg has investigated not only this problem but all possible literary relationships of the two works. He devotes separate chapters of his brochure to the various relationships of each of these writings individually, including the knowledge that each of the authors had of New Testament material. He also

has carefully studied the relation of each to the typical Jewish methods of exegesis known as *haggadah* and *halakah*. He has also made a careful study of what is to be regarded as the original form of the teaching concerning the "two ways," and the possible dependence of one of these writings upon the other in other parts of them. The result of his study is to show that both writings are thoroughly Jewish in character, method and spirit, although each is also Christian. The writers of both must therefore have been Jewish Christians. The *Epistle of Barnabas* he finds to be in thorough accord with rabbinic methods as exhibited in the Talmud, although penetrated everywhere by the Alexandrian point of view. The *Didache* although thoroughly Jewish in its method and outlook is less strictly rabbinical. As a result of his careful investigation, Muilenburg is convinced that the *Didache* is dependent upon *Barnabas* and that it is the later writing of the two. He finds himself in substantial agreement with Harnack, who placed the composition of *Barnabas* about 131 A.D. The composition of the Teaching would in his judgment necessarily belong to a later date. The *terminus ad quem* would be the date of the composition of the *Didasalia*, about a century later. Accordingly the *Didache*, if these results are valid, would belong to the second, or possibly the early part of the third century.

Although Dr. Muilenburg has amassed an impressive array of material and although his work evinces upon every page careful scholarship, his results are to the reviewer not altogether convincing. This is no reflection upon the author, but is due to the necessarily indeterminate character of literary data. When two writings touch on the same subject and employ the same language there is always room for differences of opinion as to which couches the common material in the most original form. Take, for example, the treatment of the "two ways" in these two writings: in the *Didache* this teaching is placed near the beginning, in the foreground, and is arranged in a logical way. In *Barnabas* it is found near the end of the Epistle in Chapters 18 to 21 and appears in a much less logical form. Muilenburg assumes that *Barnabas* is prior to the *Didache* because of the absence of logical

arrangement. There is room, however, here for another point of view. Each writer is an independent person and one can never predict, as he could of a machine, what any individual may decide to do. Again as to the date of *Barnabas*. It is clear that when it was written the War of 70 had already passed and the Rebellion of Bar Chocaba in 132 had not yet begun. Chapter 4, v. 4, however, is quite open to the interpretation which Lightfoot put upon it which would lead to the first century dating of the writing and possibly to the reign of Vespasian. The reviewer is not yet convinced that such an early date is impossible.

As to the *Didache*, it does not seem to the reviewer that the facts adduced by Muilenburg are sufficiently decisive to outweigh the considerations urged by Streeter (*The Primitive Church*, New York, 1929; see especially Appendix C) which indicate that the *Didache* originated in the region of Antioch prior to the time of Ignatius. Muilenburg has, however, imposed upon all New Testament scholars and church historians a debt of gratitude for his careful study.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

*The Carthusian Order in England.* By E. Margaret Thompson. London: S. P. C. K.; New York: Macmillan, 1930, pp. x + 550. \$7.00.

There exist a number of excellent studies of individual English Charterhouses, but this is the first work covering the entire history of the Order in England. In fact it does more than this, for the first part of the work (130 pp.) deals with the origin of the Order and the Rule. Had it been found possible for the author to have included an account of the Carthusian rite, we would have in this part a really complete account of the Carthusian life and discipline.

The second part of the book (231 pp.) deals with the English houses, giving a record of each Charterhouse. The Carthusians remained truer to their original ideals than many of the Orders, but these chapters show that there was change, even among the Carthusians. The idea of the solitary life tended to give place to that of the enclosed life, the London Carthusians departed from

the severe traditions of their Order as to the adornment of churches, the Coventry Carthusians permitted a school for boys within the very walls of the Charterhouse. But in spite of these, and other, departures from the early Carthusian practice, the English Carthusians, Miss Thompson concludes, "were punctilious, on the whole, in their observance of the rule."

The economic history of each of the houses is given in great detail. Most of the English Charterhouses were poor, none of them really rich, and the Great Pestilence had made their financial position in many cases very precarious.

The last part of the book, which will probably prove the most interesting to the general reader, tells the tragic end of the English Charterhouses under the tyranny of Henry VIII, especially the history of the London Charterhouse, its heroic resistance, and its glorious martyrs.

A few mistakes should be corrected. On p. 38, 'third and fifth feria (Tuesday and Wednesday)' is obviously wrong; on 128, 'the third compilation of statutes' should be 'the second compilation of statutes'; on p. 239, '£1000' should be '£100.'

W. F. WHITMAN.

*The Christian Ideal for Human Society.* By Alfred E. Garvie. N. Y.: Richard R. Smith, 1930, pp. 477. \$4.00.

Principal Garvie's trilogy on Christian apologetics, dogmatics and ethics still awaits its first volume, but with *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead* (1925) and the present volume is complete in its constructive portion, and stands as the most substantial and systematic presentation of liberal British non-conformity in our time.

The Introduction, setting forth the dependence of Christian morals on Christian faith, is followed by an historical section whose brevity is hardly consistent with the author's contention that "the Christian ideal has been presented, and is being realized in history. Hence the treatment of Christian ethics must be historical" (p. 41). It is typical of contemporary emphasis that the modern part of the historical survey is concerned almost entirely

with the economic ethic of Protestantism. More individual is Dr. Garvie's dissent from the contemporary choice of the conception of the Kingdom of God as the "one distinctive dominant conception in which all the variety of moral phenomena can be harmonized" (p. 42). He prefers the conception of "the family of God" as more consonant with the doctrine of God as Father, while preserving the social note needed to counteract the traditional individualism of the Christian ethic.

Part II, Ethical, begins with a discussion of the Christian standard of moral judgment, concluding that this is "self-realization through self-sacrifice as participation in the fulfillment of the divine purpose" (p. 140). Then follow chapters on "The Human Ideals" of truth, beauty, holiness, utility and love; "The Cardinal Virtues," notably temperance, which, puritanically enough, turns out to be total abstinence when applied to drinking, smoking and gambling; and "The Christian Graces."

Part III, Psychological, discusses personality as analyzed in recent British biology and psychology, and then restates the doctrine of individual redemption in the light of these sciences. Shand's psychology and the essays on *The Spirit* by Streeter and others largely form the basis of this section. As a link between the ethical and sociological sections, this part of the book suffers from being in purely individualistic terms, and would gain from a section on social psychology.

Part IV, Sociological, constitutes two-fifths of the whole. After an introductory section which justifies his procedure in abandoning the traditional division into individual and social ethics in favor of a sociological scheme, Dr. Garvie deals successively with the relations of the family, education, industry, leisure and culture, citizenship, international life and the church. He has in mind primarily the problems of British society, but these are enough like our own to give the book value for American students. The author's position is at times conservative, as in his reluctance to tolerate contraception, but usually he takes a moderate liberal position, with a melioristic program based on the conviction that social progress toward a divinely intended



consummation is to be furthered by "man's participation in the fulfillment of the divine purpose." He ends with what might better have been an appendix, a brief and drastic criticism of Barthian teaching "which, if true, would challenge the hope here advanced at every point" (p. 465).

The book has been well planned and solidly constructed. As a manual for use in theological schools, it is an improvement on Strong, Smyth, and Adam. It lacks the brilliance of Dean Inge's *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, but is less prejudiced and more substantial. Anglican readers will miss the contribution of Catholic ethics (there is but one reference to Aquinas, and that at second-hand), and all teachers of Christian ethics will regret that there is no chapter on the history of Christian ethical theory. But I doubt if they can find a better book in English for their students' use.

N. B. NASH.

*A Wanderer's Way.* By Charles E. Raven. New York: Holt, 1929, pp. xi + 220. \$1.75.

"You feel about Jesus just as you do about your birds." Out of this remark of a friend, says the author, this book grew. The remark lay in the back of his mind, suddenly popped up into consciousness, and took shape as a desire to write what his family called "A Bird-Book about God." What a charming idea! And why not? Surely a disciple would be able to write about Jesus Christ with all the gaiety and abandon and vibrant passion of fellowship which Sidney Lanier pours out to a mocking-bird, or Shelley pours out to a lark.

This wanderer's way is the way of reality. Religion in his school days is mysterious, unearthly; it comes as a shock when he discovers that choir-boys wear boots and stockings "instead of sandals like the children in stained glass windows." That is far back in the first of these five delightful chapters. The years at Cambridge before the war marked the wanderer's "coming of age." Now Jesus has become the one secure fact in life to him. "A multitude of simple sacraments convey His real presence. I am watching a mother bird feed her young and the scene is

linked up with Jesus and the sparrows, and His prayer for daily bread and all the sacred mystery of spiritual food. My lily bulbs at last break through the crust of the earth and Jesus is inevitably present as I consider how they grow. . . . There may be, there is, an added dignity attaching to what has been through the centuries the crowning sacrament, but, if I, being unfit to enter into the riches of that supreme mystery, can feed my soul on the crumbs that fall elsewhere from His table, surely He is the same and will not drive me from Him."

In spite of its exclusiveness, its insistence upon orthodoxy, its bondage (*sic*) to the letter of Scripture and tradition, its conservatism and respectability, Canon Raven finds the Church of England "the society at once best fitted to be God's agent among our people and nearest in outlook and desire to the mind of Christ. It has stood always for a reasonable faith, for tolerance of diverse opinions, for the right to revise and reinterpret, for the importance of sound learning."

This is a charming, stimulating, imaginative record of a life of spiritual beauty.

GEO. CRAIG STEWART.

*Body, Mind and Spirit.* By Elwood Worcester and Samuel McComb. Boston: Marshall Jones, 1931, pp. xix + 367.

At the end of his preface Dr. Worcester writes that he has put together his part of the work while in the wilds of Canada and without access to books. We must be glad of this because it has forced the author to fall back on his own experiences and the records of his own experiences seem to the reviewer the most important part of the book. It is difficult to know which chapters have been written by Dr. Worcester and which others are the work of Canon McComb. It is seldom that two writers can so successfully pool their assets that they can produce a book which is not marred by the outstanding differences of two experienced and valued minds.

Any book by Drs. Worcester and McComb dealing with mental healing must be interesting. The chief interest in the present

volume lies in the personal side lights on their own practice which are scattered through the various chapters. The book has some thirteen chapters all together. The first chapter deals with the Subconscious Mind. Great prominence is given to the Freudian theories of the unconscious, and to the therapeutic results that have been derived from these theories. The second chapter on the Psycho-Neuroses gives the author a chance to introduce not only Freud, but also the work of Breuer, Adler and Jung. The case histories in chapter three are of special interest and many of them have apparently been drawn from the author's own experience. The chapters on Sleep and Insomnia and on Dreams are less interesting. Probably because the whole subject of dreams and their interpretation is such a debatable ground. By natural sequence chapter six deals with Manic Depressive States. The author now turns toward the therapeutic side of his work and discusses Suggestion and Hypnosis. Then we are given a brief sketch of the Four Curses of Mankind, Tuberculosis, Cancer, Lues and Alcohol. The later chapters of the book deal with the religious elements in Dr. Worcester's work. There is a section on the Healing Deeds of Jesus, another on Prayer and a final chapter on Spiritual Healing.

One hesitates to offer any criticism of a book of this kind because one is so grateful to the two authors for the human material contained in it. They do not seem to be familiar with the latest historical research on the question of the origin of lues. Secondly, in the discussion of alcoholism they seem to be much too optimistic as to the possibilities of dealing constructively with chronic alcoholics. If Dr. Worcester's alcoholic cases have all ended as successfully as the few cases which he describes he deserves great commendation. But one can not help feeling that his methods of treatment when tried by men less able than himself may not have such satisfactory results.

The book is put together rather loosely. It suggests a collection of papers written at different times rather than the plan of a unified and scientific work. What one misses most of all is an emphasis on the possibilities of the spiritual life and on the

use of the Christian Sacraments. The ordinary ways of the spiritual life as they are contained in books on ascetic theology find no place in Dr. Worcester's theory of mental therapeutics. The reviewer feels that the writer of a book of this kind is in a sense beginning at the wrong end of things. If people would earnestly practice the Catholic religion and develop in themselves some of the spiritual powers that may be developed in the least gifted man, there would be no panic states, no psycho-neuroses and the subconscious or unconscious mind would give very little trouble.

JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER.

*Richtlinien evangelischer Theologie zur Überwindung der gegenwärtigen Krisis.*  
By Georg Wobbermin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1929, pp.  
iv + 145. M. 7.50.

Professor Wobbermin of Göttingen deals in these pages with what he views as the present crisis in German Protestant theology. In seven brief chapters, dealing with such subjects as Theology as a Science, The Church, Revelation, Faith, The Bible, he indicates what he considers to be the right directions for evangelical theology to follow. Himself a loyal disciple of Schleiermacher, whom he defends against misrepresentation by recent interpreters, he would remain true to the spirit of Luther and Schleiermacher, and avoid the older errors of traditional orthodoxy and rationalism with which Schleiermacher contended, and the more recent errors of "Historismus" and "Psychologismus." These last are the villains in recent German theology. By "Historismus" they mean the tendency to turn all theological work into historical research and to seek the answers to the ultimate questions of religion by historical methods. By "Psychologismus" they mean the attempt to deal with religion as a branch of empirical psychology and to find the basic data of theology by an analysis of religious states of mind. Wobbermin applauds Barth for his rejection of these two tendencies in modern theology, but holds that Barth does not do justice to the essential place of historical study as a protection against pseudo-history or to the value of

the subjective emphasis as a guard against externalism. Many other phases of recent theological discussion are dealt with: the relation of theology to the sciences and philosophy, the place of faith in revelation, the relation of the special revelation in the Christian Gospel to the general revelation in religion. In the main the book is strongly Lutheran in its position, stressing Faith, the Bible and the invisible Church. Both the text and the appended bibliography are a valuable guide to recent theological literature in Germany.

ANGUS DUN.

## NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

### Biblical; Judaism

*Pentateuch and Haftorahs.* Hebrew Text, English Translation, with Commentary. Ed. by Dr. J. H. Hertz. *Exodus.* Oxford University Press, 1930, p. xvi + 611. \$3.00.

A commentary for popular use upon the Lessons used in the synagogue. The volume is beautifully printed and is a good illustration of the fine educational texts produced by the English Jews. Students of Hebrew will find the clear type and handy translation (on the opposite page) a real help in their pursuit of that language.

*Der Prophet Jeremiah.* By Paul Volz. Aufl. 3. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930, pp. iv + 55. M. 2.40.

Third edition of a remarkable lecture first published in 1918. It is not difficult to imagine the appeal that Jeremiah makes to religiously minded folk in contemporary Germany—at the hands of a skilled and sympathetic interpreter like Professor Volz.

*By the Waters of Babylon. A Story of Ancient Israel.* By Louis Wallis. New York: Macmillan, 1931, pp. 222. \$2.00.

This is a historical novel, the setting being the period of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and so not quite the days of "ancient Israel." The book conforms to one of the canons ruling historical fiction, for it does give a true picture of the conditions of those days. There is a faint story, and even a suggestion of the inevitable romance, but not enough to maintain any interest in the plot. There is too much repetition, too much space given to long—and to a modern reader—tiresome discussions about the Jewish interests of that day. L. W. B.

*The Jewish Library.* Second Series. Edited by Leo Jung. New York: Bloch, 1930, pp. xii + 295. \$2.50.

Professor Jung's earlier volume was evidently a success—as it deserved to be. The present collection of essays deals with a variety of subjects, such as "The Romance of the Hebrew Alphabet," "Faith and Science," "Worship as a Mode of Study," "Fundamental Ideals and Proclamations of Judaism"—an important essay by Chief Rabbi Dr. Hertz, "What is Orthodox Judaism?" (by the editor himself), "The Centrality of Palestine in Jewish Life," "Dogma in Judaism," and "The Jews at the Time of the Middle Ages."



*Moses Mendelssohn, Critic and Philosopher.* By H. Walter. New York: Bloch, 1930, pp. vii + 217.

An interesting biography of one of the great men in modern Judaism—*e.g.*, the era of the *Aufklärung*.

*The Messiah Jesus.* By Robert Eisler. Tr. by Alexander H. Krappe. New York: Dial Press, 1931, pp. xxviii + 638. \$10.00.

The German edition of this remarkable work has already been reviewed in this journal (ATR xii. 325-328, April 1930). There is little to add to that review. Readers of English can now test for themselves the conclusions offered by the reviewer. Eisler's confidence in the value of the Old Slavonic version of Josephus and of the mediæval Josippon is not shared by the overwhelming majority of present-day scholars, nor even by those in a position to test the sources for themselves. The late Dr. Thackeray, for example, who had made a very careful study of the Josephan fragments, remained unconvinced of their authenticity.

Moreover, Eisler's method of argumentation appears as unacceptable as his presuppositions. For example: "The historicity of Jesus as a heretic teacher of Jewish Law is established beyond doubt by the testimony of his disciple Jacob of Kephars Sekhanjah" (p. 20). As a matter of fact, if we had only this "testimony" (?) of Jacob it is very highly doubtful if we would find ourselves in a position to assume the "historicity of Jesus as a heretic teacher of Jewish Law." And Eisler admits that this Jacob is "a man unknown to Christian sources."

The work will undoubtedly have a wide-spread influence among those who are not familiar at first hand with the Christian sources, or who do not get beyond a superficial reading of the New Testament in the Authorized Version. To such persons Eisler's 'discoveries' will be amazing, exhilarating, overwhelming. To persons thoroughly acquainted with the sources, on the other hand, the book will seem brilliant but inclusive, emitting neither light nor heat but only the pyrotechnic illumination of a flare—of value chiefly as marking some of the remaining problem-spots in the investigation of the historical sources.

It is a book that is bound to be talked about, probably talked about a great deal more than it will be read. At the very least, scholars will be indebted to Dr. Eisler for stating some of the problems as pointedly as he does, and for gathering together a mass of material which every one interested in Christian origins will be glad to have in accessible form and convenient compass.

*Studies in New Testament Christianity.* By George A. Barton. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928, pp. ix + 150. \$2.00.

A collection of papers mostly of a theological nature—that is, concerned with what used to be called "New Testament theology." They are more or less popular in character without ceasing to be learned, and cover a variety of topics, "The Fulfillment of Prophecy," "The Person of Christ," "God," "Sin," "The Death of Christ," "The Eucharist," and "The Christian Life."

*Word-Pictures in the New Testament. Vol. III. The Acts of the Apostles.*  
By Archibald Robertson. New York: Smith, 1930, pp. xvi + 490. \$3.50.

There is no doubt of Professor Robertson's great learning; there is no doubt, either, of his exasperating self-assurance, as when he says, for example, on page viii, "But all the same the traditional view that Luke is the author of the Acts holds the field with those who are not prejudiced against it." There are a good many persons who will not agree that this is a fair statement.

However, for persons who are not familiar with Greek, or who have only a bowing acquaintance with that tongue, the work will be full of suggestion. It may even be useful to students with some knowledge of Greek but who are not able to identify forms readily.

'The Clarendon Bible.' *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.*  
With Int. and Comm. by Ernest Evans. Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. 216. \$1.50.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews.* With Int. and Comm. by F. D. V. Narborough.  
Ibidem, 1930, pp. 156. \$1.75.

One cannot take up the new volumes of the Clarendon Bible as they appear from time to time without real enthusiasm. They are small in compass, modern in outlook, beautiful in format, well illustrated, and are based entirely upon the English version but with occasional references to the Greek (especially in the exegesis where the English equivalent is invariably given). They are designed for use in schools, but we could wish that they were better known throughout the American Church so that they might either be in use in church school classes, or at least be accessible to the teachers.

The point of view is thoroughly scholarly and up to date. For example, in the volume before us Mr. Evans presents the view of Paul's Corinthian correspondence now generally held by scholars, and also takes for granted the modern chronology of this period in St. Paul's life. He has made a thorough study of the standard works on the subject—without intruding them upon his less mature readers.

Mr. Narborough's little volume on Hebrews is one of the best that we have ever seen for its size. In spite of the difficulty of procuring illustrations for this volume he has succeeded admirably. The view adopted is that the Epistle was written from Rome, perhaps by Apollos, and betrays considerable dependence upon St. Paul, especially the Epistle to Romans, and upon Philo of Alexandria. It was addressed to some particular, local, Christian community ("To Hebrews" is only a second-century guess and not a very good one). Its aim was to stamp out a Jewish kind of Gnosticism which was in the ascendant in this particular community, a kind of Gnosticism which had affinities with that assailed by St. Paul in Colossians. The date assumed is soon after A.D. 70. A valuable part of the Introduction is a discussion of the leading ideas of the Epistle. The little volume cannot help but awaken a new interest and understanding of this highly important but often misunderstood early Christian writing.

*The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians.*  
By E. F. Scott. New York: Smith, 1930, pp. xi + 257. \$3.50.

Aside from the vulgarity of the general title of this series ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary")—a concession to the modern advertising mania that must have cost Dr. Moffatt more than a twinge of scholar's conscience—the series is one of the most welcome of modern commentaries on the Bible. The present volume was completed before Duncan's book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* appeared, but Professor Scott sufficiently indicates his conservative position. The imprisonment epistles were written from Rome; "due weight must certainly be allowed to all these arguments [in favor of Ephesus], but they leave out of account the unique position of Rome, the great center to which everything in that ancient world was attracted."

Professor Scott is even more conservative in his view of Ephesians, which he thinks was undoubtedly written by St. Paul himself. After summarizing all the arguments against its genuineness, he says, "Against all these arguments we must set not only the supreme excellence of the Epistle but the inimitable Pauline stamp on its thinking. It may be confidently said that there is nothing in Ephesians which Paul might not have written."

Professor Scott's abilities as an interpreter are well known and he is at his best in the present volume; and like the other volumes in the series this commentary has the advantage of Dr. Moffatt's translation. For instance, Colossians ii. 18 takes on new meaning in this new translation—"presuming on his visions" and "inflated by sensuous notions" gives much more sense than the traditional translation. It is remarkable how much can be done in interpreting the New Testament without reference to the Greek original when a good modern translation like Professor Moffatt's is made the basis of the exegesis.

*The Speaker's Bible: Epistle to the Philippians. Epistle to the Colossians.*  
Edited by Edward Hastings. Chicago: Blessing's Book Store, 1930, pp. 254. \$3.50.

The aim of the *Speaker's Bible* is "to preserve all that is worth preserving of the modern interpretation of the Bible." This is certainly an ambitious undertaking. One might gather that any further use of commentaries was at an end, once he had this work on his shelves. However, lest one assume that the series is only a digest of modern criticism, that is, of works that have already appeared, we are assured by the publishers that the series "contains also much that is new, written by the editor and others."

Setting aside all this blurbish self-commendation, however, and viewing the work for what it really is, not taking it for what it pretends to be, it is a very suggestive homiletical commentary with all kinds of material gathered from every conceivable source. There are references to the modern commentaries (this work is by no means a commentary); and also indices to modern sermons on the various texts.

The series is in line with the late Dr. Hastings' *Great Texts of the Bible*, and both in format and in quality suggests the pages of *The Expository Times*.

In this one is not disappointed, for there is no finer little journal of stimulus and inspiration than the *Times*.

*Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief.* By Heinrich Schlier. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930, pp. 78. M. 6.00.

This is number six in the "Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie" and is devoted to the study of the mythological language of the Epistle—for example, the ascension of the Redeemer, the heavenly wall, the heavenly man, the Church as the Body of Christ, the Body of Christ as a celestial structure, and the heavenly Syzygie.

The author has worked in the spirit of the late Professor Bousset and has made a very clear case for the use of popular religious concepts, not only of the Hellenistic world, but of a specific Gnostic circle. It seems to be clearer day by day that Gnosticism was a real religious force in the first century; and if it set before the Church certain real dangers, it no less provided a number of useful religious concepts.

#### Church History

*Peter Cartwright: Pioneer.* By Helen Hardie Grant. New York: Abingdon Press, 1931, pp. 222. \$2.00.

There has been a considerable revival lately of interest in the pioneer period in the Middle West. We are evidently approaching a point sufficiently remote from the "early days" to enable us to view the period objectively. It is also possible to evaluate the contributions made to civilization and religion three and four generations ago, and earlier, without being accused of partiality or partisanship.

The volume before us is a well illustrated and well written account of one of the great circuit riders in early Kentucky and Illinois; a giant of a man who helped lay the foundations of these midland commonwealths. He was a great fighter for the Lord and for righteousness in those rough times. Mrs. Grant is quite obviously an admirer of his rugged, homespun character; and although she is not a Methodist, it is doubtful if "Uncle Peter" has ever received more sympathetic biographical treatment.

*From Justinian to Luther. A.D. 518-1517.* By Leighton Pullan. Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. 256. \$4.50.

There are few men who could condense a thousand years of history into less than 250 pages without having the result either a tedious compilation of facts or a summary so sketchy as to be practically without value. Dr. Pullan is one of the few. His lectures have managed to include not only practically all the subjects usually touched on in Church histories covering the period, but several of his chapters, *e.g.*, 'The Slavs and their Missions,' 'The Three Religions in Spain,' 'Teutons, Poles and Russians,' touch upon subjects often omitted in much lengthier volumes. And, while there is inevitably great condensation, there are no glaring omissions. And above all, the lectures are in-

teresting, and at times brilliant. With his previous volume on *Religion Since the Reformation*, which appeared in 1923, this gives us one of the most readable accounts of the history of the Christian Church which we have in English.

W. F. W.

*Florilegium Patristicum*. Fasc. xxv. *Magistri Echardi Quaestiones et sermo Parisienses*. Ed. by Bernh. Geyer. Bonn: Hanstein, 1931, pp. 34. M. 1.50.

Fasc. xxvi. *De Causalitate Sacramentorum juxta Scholam Franciscanam*. Ed. by Willibrord Lampen. Ib., pp. 60. M. 2.80. Fasc. xxvii. *S. Aurelii Augustini Episcopi Hippoensis De beata vita liber*. Ed. by Michael Schmaus. Ib., pp. 23. M. 1.

Beautifully printed, conveniently sized, well edited patristic and scholastic texts, useful to the theologian, historian, philosopher, and student of Western civilization.

*Augustinus Enchiridion*. 2d ed. Ed. by Otto Scheel. Tübingen: Mohr, 1930, pp. xi + 98. M. 2.50.

This is a second edition of the little book in the series of selected ecclesiastical and dogmatic-historical sources published by Mohr in Tübingen. It is a very convenient little edition with good textual apparatus and useful indices.

*Rudolph Sohm und die Grundlegung des Kirchenrechts*. By Hans Barion. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931, pp. 28. M. 1.80.

An inaugural address delivered at Bonn, surveying the work of the late Professor Sohm.

*Corpus Confessionum*. Ed. by Caius Fabricius. Lfg. xvi, pp. 481-560. Berlin; Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1931.

The present installment includes a selection of English and French hymns of the Church of the Brethren—hymns filled with a warm and tender pietism. One great value in this collection is that it is not simply official documents, creeds, theological platforms, et cetera; but includes hymns and other semi-official collections which enable one to get at the heart of the group-life for which the sect stands.

*Joannis Calvini Opera Selecta*. Ed. by Peter Barth and William Niesel. Volume IV. Munich: Kaiser, 1931, pp. xi + 456. M. 18.

This volume contains Liber III of Calvin's *Institutio*, "De Modo Percipiendae Christi Gratiae." It is beautifully printed and has very full apparatus of variant readings derived from the successive early editions. It is a very convenient and readable edition.

*On the Government of God. A Treatise Wherein are Shown by Argument and by Examples Drawn from the Abandoned Society of the Times the Ways of God toward His Creatures.* Indited by Salvian. Tr. by Eva M. Sanford. Columbia University Press, 1930, pp. viii + 241. \$3.75.

Salvian was a priest of Marseilles in the fifth century and wrote his famous book to prove that, in spite of all contrary indications, the evils of the time were not due to God's neglect of his people but to the wickedness of men, a point of view shared with Augustine when he wrote his *City of God*.

It is not difficult to imagine the situation in which Salvian and his readers found themselves: the barbarians pouring in from the north, and the Mediterranean peoples unable to resist them; pagan society honeycombed with vice, and the Christians not entirely uncontaminated by the world in which they lived. It is easy also to see how such a situation would lead to extreme theological views, such as we meet with in the later Latin Fathers, and which placed their imprint upon all later Western Christian thought.

*The Mass: its origin and history.* By Dom Jean de Puniet. Translated by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. New York: Longmans, 1931, pp. xxiii + 203. \$2.50.

Like Adrian Fortescue's volume of similar title, which it somewhat resembles, this work is divided into two parts: Part I, Origin and History of the Mass, from the Last Supper to the Council of Trent; Part II, Exposition of the Ordinary and Canon. But whereas Fortescue is historical and critical, seriously grappling with theories and problems—in short a book for scholars; Dom de Puniet is devotional, a book for pious Catholics or for those who would know how the Catholic feels toward his Mass. Its spirit is that of awed reverence in contemplation of a venerable rite. Theories and problems are hinted at rather than dealt with, and the liturgies of Eastern Christendom are virtually ignored. But it is a delightful thing to read. Cold indeed must the reader be whose heart does not kindle with something of the author's reverence. P. V. N.

### Philosophy

*The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon.* Tr. by Robert B. Burke. 2 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928, pp. xiii + 840. \$10.00.

Dean Burke has based his translation upon the corrected text of Bridges' edition (London, 1900) from which work he has reproduced the drawings copied by Dr. Bridges from the original manuscripts. The translation is a very accurate and faithful one and gives in good English the most famous of Bacon's works. It is one of those synthetic thirteenth-century writings aiming to correlate all human knowledge—a kind of 'Outline of the Universe.' As Dean Burke has said elsewhere, "In its unity of purpose, in its encyclopædic range of subjects, in its clarity of statement, in its orderly arrangement of material, in its prophetic scientific vision, in its profound moral earnestness, the *Opus Majus* must ever remain one of the few truly great works of human genius."



There are seven parts, dealing with (I) Causes of Human Error; (II) the Relations between Philosophy and Theology; (III) the Value of the Study of Foreign Languages; (IV) the Need for Greater Mathematical Knowledge—since mathematics is the key to all sciences, even of theology!; (V) Optics; (VI) Experimental Science; and (VII) Moral Philosophy—which discusses man's relation and duty to God, to his fellows, and to himself, makes the first comparative study of religions, and proves the superiority of the Christian faith to all others.

The value of this book passes beyond the limits of a chapter in the history of science. It will be extremely interesting and useful for any person interested in the theology of the thirteenth century or in its later formulations to study it in connection with the scientific thought of that time. A similar method of investigation and of proof will be found at work; a similar limited range of data for investigation; similar handicaps; and often identical presuppositions. It was the day when science and theology started from a single home base. Of course one can see the beginnings of the modern scientific study of the universe; but it would certainly help toward a correct evaluation of mediæval theology (as a substitute either for undue exaltation or depreciation) to study mediæval theology against the background of mediæval science and history. The extraordinary thing is that such a proposal should appear—as it may perhaps appear—now. It ought to be the first step in a real historical approach to Christian dogma. Dean Burke's translation will be of real assistance to a student who wishes to carry out such a program.

*Some Dogmas of Religion.* By J. E. McTaggart. New edition, with Int. by C. D. Broad. London: Edward Arnold (New York: Longmans), 1930, pp. xxii + 299. \$2.40.

Dr. McTaggart's great work was first published in 1906, and it is a welcome sign of serious interest in philosophy at the present day to learn that a new edition has been called for. Dr. Broad's introduction is very largely based upon the obituary notice which appeared from his pen in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* in 1927.

There is also a series of emendations drawn from McTaggart's own copy which he used at Cambridge, and which is now the property of one of his pupils.

*An Anthology of Modern Philosophy.* By Daniel S. Robinson. New York: Crowell, 1931, pp. xiv + 836. \$4.50.

Professor Robinson of Indiana University has already given us an anthology of recent philosophy, and also a valuable work on *The Principles of Reasoning*, already reviewed, and the well-known volume, *The God of the Liberal Christian*. In the present work he has gathered together classic passages from all the great modern philosophers, from Paracelsus to Lotze, Caird, and Green; even Kierkegaard is here, and Schleiermacher.

Each of the thirty-two chapters of selections has an introduction, an analysis, and a set of suggestions and questions for discussion. There are also biographical sketches, and bibliographies.

All in all, the work is an admirable textbook for a course in modern philosophy, and the general reader will find in it the gist of all the great modern works in the field.

### History of Religions

*Der Islām.* Ed. by Joseph Schack. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931, pp. xii + 196. M. 9.30.

The present installment (xvi) in Bertholet's "Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch" is a collection of sources for Islam outside the Qoran, and deals with the Tradition, the Religious Laws, and Dogmas. These selections fill the first eighty-six pages. Then follow (pp. 87-147) a series of selections illustrating Islamic mysticism, ethics, and piety.

The remainder of the book illustrates the Reformers and the Modernists. It is obvious, therefore, that the book contains a wide range of material not easily accessible to the majority of students.

*Hinduism Invades America.* By Wendell Thomas. New York: The Beacon Press, 1930, pp. 300. \$3.00.

This book presents, in a popular and readable form, an accurate account of the various religious movements of Hindu origin which have come to America since the arrival of Swami Vivekananda in 1893. The teaching of these sects is set forth with commendable impartiality. One rather doubts, however, the accuracy of the author's estimate of the influence of Hinduism on American religious life. The book has an adequate bibliography and a valuable list of the addresses of Hindu organizations in America. A useful book of reference.

W. F. W.

### Doctrine

*The Faith of the Body of Christ.* By William H. Dunphy. Pp. 19.

*The Priesthood and the Body of Christ.* By George Mabry. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1930, pp. 11. 5c each.

The first two of the "American Congress Booklets," a series evidently modelled upon the English one.

*The Pastor's Pocket Bible.* By John R. Spann. New York: Smith, 1931, pp. xiv + 123.

A fine little collection of Scripture passages to read to people in trouble, or in various other situations in which a pastor is likely to find his flock as he goes about among them. Some of the passages are given in modern translations. There are two good indices.

Anglicans of the present day do not make much use of such collections. It might be a good experiment, however, to try.

*Jesus or Christianity. A Study in Contrasts.* By Kirby Page. New York: R. R. Smith, 1929, pp. vi + 326. \$1.00.

Mr. Page has succeeded in making his views so well known that they need not here be examined in detail. About a third of the present book is concerned with an indictment of historic Christianity, drawing largely upon the familiar evidence of Lecky, Lea and, more recently, G. G. Coulton; the author finds the remedy in the establishment of an ideal family relationship among men. We maintain that the antithesis of the title cannot be substantiated, that Christianity, however faultily, has followed in the teaching of its Founder. Furthermore, that the ethics of its Founder, Who "knew what was in men" and, therefore, did not expect the realization of an ideal of perfection by the race as a whole, even by the Church as a whole and always, are here misunderstood. The theology which lies back of the author's program reaches the extreme of emaciation; the most precise statement we can find is: "If God is a person, that is, has the ability to think and feel and act, and if we are persons in exactly the same sense, the only difference being that between a parent and an infant, then communication must be possible between God and ourselves" (p. 47). F. H. H.

*The Meaning of the Cross.* By Henry Sloane Coffin. Scribners, 1931, pp. 164. \$1.50.

A very distinguished preacher here tells other preachers what they can preach on the Atonement, with some confidence that the gospel will be welcomed, even in these days. What killed Christ? The sins that are most common among us now. Why did he give his life? Because he took on his conscience the sins of men, and did his utmost to win them to fellowship with God. What must we do about it? Do likewise, in union with him. No new theory of the Atonement is here, and no clear exposition of any one theory: just the main points of the general Christian faith, with a wealth of illustration and application that makes the whole thing come alive to us moderns. Some expressions are perhaps examples of homiletical hyperbole, as that Christ "had himself crucified," thought "nature" (Christ spoke of the *Father*) "morally indifferent," struggled with "an overwhelming moral confusion." And some interpretations of texts are individual. But in lecture form the book has already been of great help to many; it is already a proved success. M. B. S.

*The Measure of Our Faith.* By G. D. Rosenthal. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. x + 249. \$2.50.

This book contains a revised series of addresses delivered in the author's parish in Birmingham. But they are quite unlike ordinary sermons, for they touch real life at all points. They are an admirable help in the cultivation of personal religion. The point of view is frankly Anglo-Catholic, Mr. Rosenthal being one of the "rebels of Birmingham," but this position does not obtrude itself unduly, for there is little more in this line than occasional stress on Confession and the weekly Mass.

The addresses are characterized by sound common sense as well as by a deep and humble religious spirit. Sometimes the author becomes epigrammatic, as in discouraging a neutral attitude towards social evil he says: "We are either on the way, or else in the way." The reviewer heartily agrees with the author's rejoicing that the habit of saying the decalogue at the Eucharist is "now happily fast dying out," for it sets too low a standard for Christian conduct. L. W. B.

*Natur und Gott.* By Arthur Titius. Second edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930, Lfgen. 1-4.

The first 640 pp. of a new and revised edition of Dr. Titius' massive essay in the interests of a *rapprochement* between Science and Theology.

*Catholic Doctrine in the Bible.* By S. D. Benedict. Los Angeles, Old Catholic Truth Society, 1930, pp. 89.

This booklet presents itself as a criticism of Roman Catholic doctrine from the standpoint of the Old Catholic Church, in which the author is a bishop. It lays down the basis that the Roman Church accepts the verbal authority of Scripture and then shows the unscriptural nature of her dogmas. The author denies the Petrine Supremacy, the Infallibility of the Pope, Transubstantiation, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception. It is not clear how far the author is supported in his views by the Old Catholic Church.

D. A. MCG.

*The Definition of the Godhead.* By Dora Marsden. London: The Egoist Press, 1928, pp. 390. 21/.

Dedicated to "The Great Name hushed among us for so long, of Her, Heaven, the mighty mother of all," this book aims to be the first of a series designed to expound a philosophic system "which argues that human knowledge forms a unit which may indifferently be styled theology or the science of first principles."

That human intellect is limited from excogitating a valid philosophy of existence-in-its-entirety this book denies. "Definition" is held to be philosophy's greatest need at this moment, and the author asserts that ultimately it will be possible to describe all the propositions which philosophy and religion take note of *in terms of number*. This book then is, as it calls itself, "a book of definitions; of preliminary definitions, the Universe, Being, The Euclidean Point, First Principles, the Causal Nexus, Space, Time, Motion, Reality, Ideas."

Two succeeding companion volumes are promised—"The Mystery of Time" and "The Immemorial Cross." G. C. S.

#### Homiletics

*The Foolishness of Preaching, and Other Sermons.* By Ernest Fremont Tittle. Henry Holt, 1930, pp. 314. \$2.00.

Dr. Tittle has made the pulpit of the First Methodist Church, Evanston, famous. He is a great preacher in the best sense—thoughtful, original, inde-

pendent, searching, forceful, convincing, persuasive. There are twenty-one sermons in this volume, nine of them on Religion and the Individual; seven of them on Religion and Society, four Lenten sermons on Jesus, and the concluding one which gives the title to the volume. Such contemporary subjects as Prohibition, Patriotism, and National Defense are dealt with frankly, fairly and courageously. One may not agree with Dr. Tittle's pacifism and volsteadism and modernism, but no reader can deny the intellectual vigor of these chapters, nor the gift of simplicity and clarity and strength with which the author presents his point of view.

Every sermon rings with conviction. All in all Dr. Tittle stands among the foremost preachers in America today. G. C. S.

*Why Preach Christ? A Plea for the Holy Ministry.* By G. A. Johnston Ross. Harvard University Press, 1929, pp. 114. \$1.50.

These are the William Belden Noble Lectures delivered at Harvard in 1928. The five chapters in this little book constitute a fresh and vigorous statement of the problems which challenge the minister today. At the heart of Dr. Ross's point of view is his recognition that "the first step in building up a religion is neither the framing of a theology nor the thinking out of a philosophy, but the *groping of a hand for a friend*." He is hopeful of the future and sees beyond the inert and pachydermatous mass of people who seek the minimum of work and the maximum of acquisition the many who will joyously take up the work of "preaching Christ." G. C. S.

*Things I Know in Religion. A Preface to Faith.* By Joseph Fort Newton. Harper and Bros., 1930, pp. ix + 188. \$2.00.

Twelve sermons are here, some of them preached in Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, Iowa, and Vassar; some of them published in magazines, all of them appealing to religious experience as the basis of faith. The title of the volume is taken from the first sermon, which formed a part of a symposium edited by Sherwood Eddy on "What Religion Means to Me."

Dr. Newton is perhaps the most elegant sermonizer in America today; not the most effective preacher, but the one possessed of the most fluent and exquisite literary style. If he has one fault, it is the lack of robustness, of directness, of that vigor which rises out of deep, overpowering convictions; but this is greatly atoned for by the urbanity, suavity, and charm of his style, which reflects a Christian spirit of rare kindliness and serenity and devotion to beauty in all its forms but especially in the beauty of holiness. G. C. S.

*Good News from God.* By The Bishop of London. Longman, 1930, pp. 127. \$1.50.

The 1930 Lenten mission sermons by the Bishop of London. When his Lordship visited Canada and the United States a few years ago he chuckled with delight when here and there on his wanderings clergy greeted him with, "I'm so glad to meet the man whose sermons I have so often preached." One story

he especially enjoyed repeating. It seems that a person in a little country Church in Canada was preaching one Sunday morning to a lot of farmers. They liked his sermon; of course they thought it was his own; suddenly, to their amazement, they heard him read the following—"Yesterday when I was in Stepney confirming a class . . . !"

These new sermons by the Bishop are the same old ones in the main which we have learned to love—new titles, here and there new phrasing, and once in a while new illustrations; but for the most part the identical sermons on the same old glorious gospel of the Son of God. They bear repetition and are always new, because the Bishop of London is so vibrantly alive. G. C. S.

*The Cross and the Dome.* Addresses on St. Paul's Cathedral. By S. S. Alexander. Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. 47. \$1.00.

The Canon and Treasurer of St. Paul's, in honor of the restoration of the Cathedral, has published here seven interesting papers on St. Paul's and the People, St. Paul's and the City, Colet the Reformer, Butler the Thinker, Church the Scholar, Wren the Builder, and St. Paul's and its Future. Originally delivered as popular addresses, they emphasize the religious significance of St. Paul's in the life of the English people. G. C. S.

*Verba Ministerium.* An Introduction to Anglican Preaching. By John Eyre Winstanley Wallis. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Blackburn. London: Faith Press; Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1930, pp. xvi + 172. \$1.20.

A dull little old-fashioned book on preaching, which the American preacher will not find very helpful. However, like the famous workingman who, at the close of his career, found to his delight that he had been talking "prose" all his life, I am enormously pleased to discover on page 46 of this little book that every Sunday morning for a good many years I presented to my congregation a "prone." It seems that a "prone" is a short clear synthetic explanation of a doctrinal subject delivered during divine worship, usually at the parochial Eucharist on Sunday morning. I am strong for "prones" and deeply indebted to this the Vicar of Whalley for adding the word to my vocabulary. G. C. S.

*Summer Sermons.* By Elliott C. B. Darlington. Revell, 1929, pp. 63. \$1.00.

The dog-days of summer do not produce great sermons. These ten little sermonettes are no exception to the rule. They are as ephemeral as wisps of cloud in a summer sky, and as pale and empty. G. C. S.

*Renewal of Life in the Clergy.* By David Jenks. Longman, 1929, pp. xi + 112. \$1.40.

The Way of Renewal in the Church of England is one of the signs of refreshing in the life of the clergy of our communion. We of America need it too, and this little book by Father Jenks of the Society of the Sacred Mission is very welcome. It is not a book on the parochial equipment of the clergy. It deals rather with the spiritual life of the priest and pastor. The chapters on



Prayer, Bible reading, Holy Communion, "Beyond Prayer," and "Ourselves," are searching, illuminating, stimulating.

There is a valuable appendix on "Illustrations of the Devotional Use of the Bible." G. C. S.

*And So He Made Mothers.* By Margaret T. Applegarth. New York: Smith, 1931, pp. xiv + 248. \$1.50.

A compilation of stories, sayings, poems, proverbs, responsive readings, prayers, banquet suggestions, arranged to provide material for "Mother's Day." Some of it is pretty sentimental but there are some bits here and there that are worth using in the pulpit.

### Pastoral Theology

*Christendom: A Journal of Christian Sociology.* Vol. I, number 1, March, 1931. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

This new journal is designed to set forth the social applications of Anglo-Catholicism. It is well known that Anglo-Catholicism, at least in England, does not exhaust itself in propaganda for high-church ceremonial and doctrine, but takes seriously the social problems that confront our common civilization.

The editorial group back of the journal includes a few American writers. The first number contains an article by Father Thornton of the Community of the Resurrection, on "The Meaning of Christian Sociology"; one by V. A. Demant on "The Prospects of Christian Sociology in America"; and one by P. E. T. Widdrington on "The Coming of the Leisure State."

In the book section are several longer and shorter reviews, one by the Rev. Joseph Fletcher of Max Weber's recently translated *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*; and one by the Rev. W. G. Peck of Grensted's *Psychology and God*.

There are eighty pages in this number and the price is two shillings. We trust that a long future lies before this attractive and fine-spirited little journal.

*The Minister and Family Troubles.* By Elizabeth A. Dexter and Robert C. Dexter. New York: Smith, 1931, pp. xii + 97. \$1.25.

This is "a case study of the relation of the minister and the church to sex and family problems." It is based upon data collected by the Commission on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of Churches, and has the additional advantage of a careful reading by a committee of the Unitarian Ministerial Association.

The book is divided into thirteen chapters, and not only lists the cases but suggests methods of treatment. Of special value are the comments added both by the ministers who contributed the data and by the authors of the present volume. It is precisely the kind of book we are in need of in the study and teaching of Pastoral Theology.

One puts down the book with the feeling that the ministers of the Unitarian Church are an exceptional group of men, if this is the way they are studying

and handling the social and family problems that come to them. The little book marks the beginning of a method of collecting and analyzing material that might well be pursued on a larger scale in every department of Pastoral Theology.

*Nurturing Young Churchmen.* By Clifton H. Brewer. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1930, pp. xii + 153. \$1.50.

A few years ago we had the privilege of reviewing in these pages Dr. Brewer's *History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835*, the only book in the field and replete with interesting information. The present volume is evidently a continuation of the *History*. The book is sub-titled, "The Development of the Idea of Spiritual Growth." That is a very excellent caption for the period under review. The greatest work in religious education in our church has been accomplished since "Christian Nurture" became the slogan.

It may be a hundred years before men realize quite what a debt we owe William E. Gardner, who published in 1916 his prophetic *Children's Challenge to the Church*; and who in collaboration with Lester Bradner and Edward Sargent worked out the curriculum of the "Christian Nurture Series."

The volume is not only very largely an explanation and defense of the Christian Nurture Series but in the concluding chapter on "Renewed Labors" suggests the probable course of the revision now under way.

*The Bunkhouse Man.* By Edmond W. Bradwin. Columbia University Press, 1928, pp. 306. \$5.00.

This volume is "a study of work and play" in the camps of Canada, 1903-1914. Everyone familiar with present-day social problems knows that Dr. Bradwin has chosen a real field for investigation. Fortunately, as civilization advances, we may hope that there will be less and less need for labor of this type, that is, for men who practically must live under the conditions described in order to build the railroads and highways of the western world.

*Holy Matrimony and Common Sense.* By Walker Gwynne. Longmans, 1930, pp. xii + 211. \$1.25.

The late lamented Dr. Gwynne has been for years an indefatigable proponent of a revision of the Church's Canon on Marriage and Divorce, in the direction of greater strictness. His present work, the last to which he was permitted to devote himself, was evidently prepared with the coming General Convention in mind.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Gwynne had more the mind of a journalist than of a scholar or historian. The problem is one that requires the most thorough historical and critical investigation of the Biblical data, along with the broadest and most sympathetic understanding of social conditions and of individual human life, studied biologically, sociologically, and psychologically. It is a case where the logic of facts is much more important than the brilliant special

pleadings of rigorous dialecticians, determined to drive the Church into consistency at whatever cost.

Moreover, the long experience of the Church Catholic must be taken into account. It is quite true that the American Canon is somewhat unique; but its uniqueness does not lie in the "exception clause" but in its exclusion from consideration of the principle of nullity. Certainly the experience of the great world-church does not point in the direction of greater rigidity in our present canon, but the opposite. It is to be hoped that these factors will be given careful consideration at the coming Convention.

*The Golden Book of Faith.* By Thomas Curtis Clark. New York: Smith, 1931, pp. 273. \$2.00.

This is another anthology of religious poems and helps to make clear the really strong religious current running through modern English poetry. The book is arranged as follows: Poems on the Search for God; God in Nature; Providence; The Nobility and Destiny of Man; The Goodness of Life; Beauty in Nature; The Inner Life; Patience in Suffering; Strength and Courage; Sympathy and Service; Confidence; Hope and Trust; A New World; Immortality. The preacher will find it full of suggestion, and 'quotable.'

*The Story of Paul for Boys and Girls of Junior High School Age.* By Theodore G. Soares. University of Chicago Press, 1930, pp. xvii + 171.

*Teacher's Manual.* Pp. xviii + 139. \$1.50.

This is very largely a scaling down of Robinson's *Life of Paul* to meet the requirements of junior high school age. There is nothing particularly new about it. The "source-material" in Part 2 of the pupil's book is not so much source-material as discussion of special topics by the author. However, much of it is very interesting and will doubtless prove useful.

Henry's *Paul, Son of Kish*, is also made use of, and the pupils are regularly directed to read "Luke's story" (Acts), "Paul's story" (the Epistles), and "Henry's story," the book just cited. One does not quite get the point of such unnecessary vulgarizing; further, it certainly obscures the dependence of 'Henry' upon St. Luke and St. Paul.

*A Book of Devotions for Men and Boys.* By Benjamin F. P. Ivins. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. 82. 60c.

*A Book of Devotions for Women and Girls.* Compiled by Ada L. Clark. Foreword by Thomas Darst. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. xiv + 98. 60c.

Useful little books of devotion small enough to carry in a vest pocket or handbag, with just the minimum of necessary prayers for daily use and for the Holy Communion.

Bishop Ivins in his manual does away with the time-honored self-examination by the Ten Commandments, and has a much more up-to-date and penetrating set of questions.

*Simple Meditations and Intercessions on the Stations of the Cross.* By Elizabeth Morison. London: Faith Press; Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. 70. 40c.

Granted the wisdom of such devotions, the present little book will possibly be found useful by many devout persons.

*Prayer Book Counsel and Penances for the Use of the Confessor.* Arranged by Ralph H. LeMessurier. London: Faith Press; Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. viii + 133. 80c.

A little book intended to be a *vademecum* for the priest in the confessional. It is dedicated "To blessed Francis of Assisi, who found his inspiration and vocation in the public liturgy of the Church." The book is one more welcome sign of a real effort on the part of extreme Anglo-Catholics to remain in contact with the Prayer Book in spite of the temptation to pursue foreign devotions to the exclusion of our own English liturgy.

*The Health of the Soul.* By James Wareham. Oxford: Mowbray; Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1931, pp. 45. 40c.

A little book of addresses, very sane and sensible, as follows: Spiritual Invalidism, The Fresh Air of Heaven, The Bread of Life, Healing Medicine, Work and Rest.

The book is by the Organizing Secretary of the Association for Promoting Retreats. It deserves wide circulation and will be very useful.

*The Jesus of the Poets.* An Anthology. Ed. by Leonard R. Gribble. New York: Smith, 1930, pp. 157. \$1.25.

A fine selection of poems about, or addressed to, our Lord, from Cynewulf to the present. One misses two or three that ought to be here—Gilder's 'Song of a Pagan,' for example. But publishers' copyrights may have had something to do with their absence. As it stands, the volume should be in every parson's library—indeed, at every parson's 'beddes hede.'

*Jesus and My First Communion.* By W. M. Bull. Morehouse, 1930, pp. 32. 40 cents.

A beautifully illustrated booklet containing an instruction in preparation for first communion.

*The Mirror of the Months.* By Sheila Kaye-Smith. Harper's, 1931, pp. 68. \$1.25.

A book of devotional meditations for the various months of the year, in the author's best style.

*Cross-Roads.* By John Oxenham. Longmans, 1931, pp. 41. 60c.

This little book is sub-titled, "The Story of Four Meetings," and leads up to its climax in the crucifixion—the Third Meeting. The Fourth Meeting is

by way of epilogue: "That they met again, I am sure. But of that meeting no man can tell." It is a very suggestive little book for Holy Week.

### Reference

*The Catholic Encyclopædic Dictionary.* Edited by Donald Attwater. New York: Macmillan, 1931, pp. xvi + 576. \$4.00.

A very handy and reasonably priced dictionary to take the place of the old single volume one now out of print, and also out of date. It has just been announced that the title of this volume is to be changed as soon as the present issue in stock has been sold, and a less ambiguous title will then be used—"A Catholic Dictionary."

The point of view of the work is thoroughly conservative, and the authors appear to be mainly English, Irish, and Continental. It contains a number of articles which non-Roman Catholics will be glad to find when they turn to it for quick reference; and there is a fairly good bibliography at the end of the book—if one excepts the pitiful representation of Biblical works.

There is also an appended list of ecclesiastical titles and modes of address. Considering the increasing use of titles in other quarters than the Roman Church, such a list may be suggestive if not authoritative!

*A Greek-English Lexicon.* Compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. New edition revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick MacKenzie, and with the coöperation of many scholars. Part 5: *θησαυροποικω-κώψ*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. 801-1020. \$3.50.

The new installment of the new edition of Liddell and Scott carries the work down to the end of the letter *Kappa*. This is on page 1020; in the old edition it came on page 868. Since the work is approaching its middle point it is obvious that the new edition will be three or four hundred pages longer than the last.

Workers in the field of New Testament and early Christian literature will welcome the new edition quite as warmly as classicists, though a Patristic Lexicon is planned to supplement the present work. The historical view of the development of meanings which the present lexicon provides is indispensable, and no special lexicon can entirely displace it. Much use is made of the papyri and late classical literature; for example, the word *Kakourgos* which came to have the specialized meaning of "malefactor" or "criminal in the eye of the law" is illustrated, in this sense, from the papyri and the Gospel of Luke. It was at Athens, apparently, that the word had the technical meaning "thief" or "robber." This, of course, throws an interesting light on the Passion Narrative.

It is expected that the work will be complete in ten parts. Purchasers may still effect a considerable saving by subscribing before the next part appears, sometime in the current year.

*Künstlerkarten des Volkskunstverlags.* Series 58-60. Lahr in Baden: J. R. Kentel, 1931. M. 1 each.

A beautiful series of post cards illustrating the city of Jerusalem, seven in each series. After photographs taken by Paul Hommel.

*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* 2nd Ed. Lfg. 98-99. Ed. by Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931. M. 3.60.

The current installment brings the new edition of the RGG down toward the end of Volume V; that is, down to the article on "Slavery." The new encyclopædia is an indispensable guide to contemporary German theological thought. It is a guide also to theology generally, and should be in every reference library.



